

302189

JPRS-TAC-85-026

27 August 1985

## Worldwide Report

# ARMS CONTROL

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;  
Distribution Unlimited

19980722 129

THIS QUANTITY IS UNLIMITED

**FBIS**

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY  
NATIONAL TECHNICAL  
INFORMATION SERVICE  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

10  
112  
A06

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

27 August 1985

# WORLDWIDE REPORT

## ARMS CONTROL

### CONTENTS

#### GENERAL

Soviet Labor Paper Urges Greater Disarmament Role for ILO (E. Aleksandrov; Moscow TRUD, 21 May 85).....	1
Soviet Poet Argues USSR Compelled To Develop Atomic Bomb (Konstantin Skvortsov; Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, No 28, 10 Jul 85).....	4
French Editorial Views USSR, U.S. Arms Proposals (Paris LE MONDE, 31 Jul 85).....	5
Polish Head of State Speaks on Arms Race, Disarmament Talks (Henryk Jablonski; Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU, 23 Jul 85).....	7
Evolution of Postwar Polish Views on Disarmament Reviewed (Wojciech Multan; Warsaw SPRAWY MIEDZYNARODOWE, No 2, Feb 85).....	9

#### U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR Briefs Kohl on Second Round Geneva Talks (Hamburg DPA, 31 Jul 85).....	23
Nakasone Welcomes Reagan-Gorbachev Meeting (Tokyo KYODO, 3 Jul 85).....	24

#### SPACE ARMS

USSR: Ukrainian Journal Hits U.S. Policy on Space Arms (Yuriy Kuzmich Golovanev; Kiev KOMMUNIST UKRAINY, No 5, May 85).....	25
---	----

FRG Firm Announces Participation in SDI Program (Dankward Seitz; Bonn DIE WELT, 26 Jul 85).....	36
FRG Foreign Minister Views 'Star Wars,' Eureka, Detente (Hamburg DPA, 27 Jul 85).....	37
FRG Government Spokesman Views SDI Participation (Hamburg DPA, 31 Jul 85).....	38
FRG's Mischnick Notes GDR 'Interest' in Eureka (Hamburg DPA, 2 Aug 85).....	39
FRG's Strauss Interviewed on 'Star Wars' (Franz Josef Strauss; Vienna Television Service, 26 Jul 85).....	40
French Foreign Minister Dumas on Finnish Eureka Role (Helsinki International Service, 1 Aug 85).....	41
Norwegian Government Urged To Keep Options Open on SDI (Editorial; Oslo AFTENPOSTEN, 23 Jul 85).....	42
Australia Defense Chief Sees Little Gain From SDI Research (Melbourne Overseas Service, 29 Jul 85).....	44
Nakasone, Mitterrand Disagree on 'Star Wars' Program (Tokyo KYODO, 14 Jul 85).....	45

#### CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

Soviet Army Paper on History of U.S. Chemical Arms Policy (P. Filippov; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 16 Jun 85).....	47
--	----

#### NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

New Zealand Antinuclear Legislation To Be Introduced This Year (Wellington THE EVENING POST, 19 Jul 85; Melbourne Overseas Service, 1 Aug 85).....	50
U.S. To Be Informed	50
Official Reaffirms Plan	51
New Zealand Statement on ANZUS Position (Paul Campbell; Hong Kong HONG KONG STANDARD, 1 Aug 85)....	52

#### NUCLEAR TESTING

Soviet Press Assails U.S. Response to Moratorium Offer (Various sources, various dates).....	54
Test of U.S. Sincerity	54
U.S. 'Responsible Attitude' Needed, by Tomas Kolesnichenko	55
Wants Continued Testing, by Aleksandr Zholkver	56

FRG Politician Cited	57
U.S. Observers 'Dissatisfied'	57
Verification Concerns 'Hypocritical', by Vladimir Bogachev	59
U.S. Wants Continued Testing	60
U.S. Record Criticized, by Aleksandr Zholkver	61
Total Ban Needed, by Vikentiy Matveyev	62
U.S. 'Counterproposal' Hit, by Yevgeniy Grigoryev	64
PRAVDA Review 4 August, by Thomas Kolesnichenko	65
U.S. Distorts Arguments	67
White House Official Cited, by Igor Kudrin	68
Reagan News Conference Remarks	69
U.S. Stand 'Destructive', by Nikolay Shishlin	70
Reagan 'Conditions' Criticized, by Vladimir Bogachev	70
Army Paper Commentary	71
PRAVDA Editorial Article	72
 USSR Hits U.S. Invitation To Observe Test (Moscow TASS, 2 Aug 85; Moscow Television Service, 2 Aug 85).....	   75
'Clumsy Maneuver', by Yuriy Kornilov	75
Try To Forestall Moratorium, by Vitaliy Kobysh	75
 Soviet Officials Hold Press Conference on Moratorium (Various sources, various dates).....	  77
Moscow Television Coverage	77
TASS Reports Questions and Answers	81
Fuller Report on Questions and Answers	83
 Soviet Disarmament Conference Delegate on Moratorium (Moscow World Service, 30 Jul 85; Moscow TASS, 6 Aug 85)...	  88
Publicizes Gorbachev Statement	88
Addresses Conference	88
 USSR: Reports of World Response in Favor of Moratorium (Moscow TASS, various dates; Moscow Television Service, 30 Jul 85).....	  90
U.S. Congressmen	90
Alan Cranston	90
U.N. General Secretary	91
Portuguese Communist Party	91
Nicaraguan Deputy Minister	91
Nonaligned Coordination Bureau	92
News, Peace Organizations, by Valeriy Korzin	92
World Peace Council	93
Austrian Socialist	94
Fidel Castro	94
Soviet Trade Unions	94

Soviet UN Mission Holds Press Conference on Moratorium (Moscow TASS, 2 Aug 85).....	96
TASS Condemns Nakasone Reaction to Moratorium (Moscow TASS, 2 Aug 85).....	97
Australia on U.S. Acceptance of Test Ban Treaty Program (Melbourne Overseas Service, 28 Jul 85).....	98
Polish Government Spokesman on USSR Moratorium, UN Delegation (Warsaw Television Service, 30 Jul 85).....	99
Poles See Nuclear Moratorium as Consistent USSR Policy (Ryszard Wojna; Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA, 30 Jul 85).....	100
Polish Reporting on USSR Nuclear Test Decisions, U.S. Response (Warsaw Domestic Service, 30 Jul 85).....	102
'Negative' U.S. Reaction Noted, by Andrzej Wyhowicz	102
U.S. 'Offensive' Strategy Noted, by Maksymilian Berezowski	102
Polish Commentaries on Soviet Test Moratorium (Warsaw Television Service, 29 Jul 85; Warsaw PAP, 30 Jul 85).....	104
Contrasted With U.S. Policy, by Zdzislaw Morawski	104
Decision of 'Great Importance'	104
Significance for Helsinki Noted	105

GENERAL

JPRS-TAC-85-026  
27 August 1985

## SOVIET LABOR PAPER URGES GREATER DISARMAMENT ROLE FOR ILO

Moscow TRUD in Russian 21 May 85 p 3

[Article by E. Aleksandrov under the rubric "International Labor Movement":  
"Defend the Right to Life: An Active Struggle for Disarmament is the ILO's  
Direct Responsibility"]

[Text] The International Labor Organization [ILO] has a prominent place  
among the specialized institutions of the UN: its rules stipulate that one  
of its basic goals is the task of defending the rights of the workers.

Presently, under conditions of a significant increase in the activity of the  
militaristic circles, which is creating a serious threat of a new world war  
breaking out, trade unions of various hues all agree that the most import-  
ant, the principal right of the working man is--his right to life. One would  
think that there could not be the slightest doubt that the ILO would con-  
stantly keep this right in mind. However, we are forced to admit with  
profound dismay that right up to the present day it does not display enough  
concern for it, and instead devotes itself to secondary problems.

For a number of years now the governments of the USSR and other socialist  
countries have, in the course of the work of the ILO general conferences,  
persistently raised the question of the fact that the organization can and  
should sharply increase its contribution to the struggle for peace and dis-  
armament. Who, if not the ILO, should be seriously concerned with problems  
of the socio-economic consequences of the arms race and disarmament? After  
all, the arms race is not only pushing mankind to the brink of the precipice  
but also has ruinous consequences for the position of working people today.

The cyclical economic crisis involving most of the nations of the West in  
the early 1980's has led to a situation in which unemployment in developed  
capitalist states still exceeds 30 million persons, even according to  
reduced official figures. The steady decline in industrial growth rates  
being observed today will inevitably entail new blows to employment. And the  
Reagan Administration's announced plans for preparations for "Star Wars"  
already involves a sharp reduction in social programs in the United States.

Under these conditions the ILO's direct responsibility is to immediately  
summon all members to active involvement in the struggle for disarmament.  
Isn't it time to remove from the ILO secretary's desk the proposal long  
since introduced by the representatives of the socialist states?

As recently as 1981, after persistent demands by delegations from the socialist countries, the ILO adopted a resolution on the economic and social consequences of disarmament. However, as a practical matter it was not put into effect. Thus, in accordance with this resolution the November 1983 session of the ILO Administrative Council adopted a resolution on carrying out research in two directions. First of all, on studying problems of conversion--that is, switching production of defense industry to output of goods for civilian needs. And secondly, on the socio-economic consequences of aid to the developing countries by virtue of reducing military spending.

In the elapsed period, research on the first of these directions has been clearly unsatisfactory. For now, the matter is limited to publishing articles in the ILO magazine, "International Survey of Labor".

And as far as the second direction of planned research is concerned--which has special significance for the states of Asia, Africa and Latin America--not a single dollar has been allocated for conducting the research, and not a single program for action has appeared in this important area.

It is completely obvious that the ILO, which was in its time awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, is obliged to radically change its approach to questions of participation in the struggle for peace and disarmament. In any case there has long been a need to prepare a special program on "Socio-Economic Aspects of Disarmament".

A positive impulse for solving these tasks could be provided were the ILO general director to make a speech at one of the coming sessions of the ILO General Conference, in which the point of view of the ILO secretariat were expressed on ways and means for the organization to take part in the struggle for disarmament. The next step in this same direction could be including in the agenda for the ILO General Conference a special point on "Disarmament and Social Policy", in order that the result of examination of this question could be the adoption of a Universal Declaration on Disarmament and the Socio-Economic Process. Such proposals have already been introduced by representatives of the socialist countries at sessions of the ILO administrative organs.

It is also well-known that, at the 38th Session of the UN General Assembly, Resolution 38/188 was adopted, which proposes "specialized institutions and other organs and programs, within the framework of the UN system, and to further expand its contribution in its own areas of competence in the matter of arms limitation and disarmament". At the last UN General Assembly, the 39th, a special resolution was adopted, which requires all specialized UN institutions to take part in celebrating the 40th Anniversary of the Victory over Fascism.

At the present time, when all the nations of the world are solemnly marking this anniversary, it would be desirable for the ILO to take heed of the lessons of history, which bear witness to the fact that war must be



forestalled, lest it start. It is time for the International Labor Organization to make use of its capabilities to achieve those goals to which the UN has summoned it, goals which are supported by the broad masses of the working people, and the peace-loving forces of the entire planet.

9006

CSO: 5200/1216

GENERAL

SOVIET POET ARGUES USSR COMPELLED TO DEVELOP ATOMIC BOMB

/Editorial Report/ Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 28 10 July 1985 carries on page 6 a whole-page feature of "Fragments" from the verse play "Kurchatov" /inventor of the Soviet atomic bomb/ by Konstantin Skvortsov. The extracts presented trace the scientist's gradual progression from doubts about the morality of the atomic bomb to his eventual success in building it. The military justification is presented through Kaftanov, head of the State Defense Committee, who warns that "they are threatening to create a 'dommsday weapon.' They are working on it now." After a scene in which Mephistopheles warns Kurchatov of the risk he runs in his search to build the atomic bomb, the action moves on to Stalin's office, where "the author speaking for Stalin" convinces the scientist of the need to build the bomb to "save the fatherland." The Stalin character points out to him the hardships that the country is enduring in allocating resources needed elsewhere in order to produce the weapon essential for its defense against a threat presented thus:

"We have no choice. The cold war is a war of minds and nerves. But it cannot last long.... Thus, the fatherland's salvation is in your hands.... Understand that we cannot wait for them to begin, but there is no doubt that they are ready!..."

The "Fragments" close with Kurchatov's success in creating the atomic bomb and his justification that "our enemies forced us int it."

CSO: 5200/1343

GENERAL

FRENCH EDITORIAL VIEWS USSR, U.S. ARMS PROPOSALS

PM011433 Paris LE MONDE in French 31 Jul 85 p 1

[Editorial: "False Start"]

[Text] On the eve of the anniversary of the Helsinki accords and of the fall East-West meetings, both Moscow and Washington are launching into a competition of rival statements to demonstrate their good will. But it has been something of a false start: While the Soviet No 1 has announced that he is halting all nuclear tests through 1 January 1986 and asked Reagan to do the same, the latter has invited him to come and inspect U.S. tests. And each of the two capitals has totally and immediately rejected the other's proposals.

True, as both Washington and Moscow have admitted, for that matter, there is nothing new in all this. In his September 1984 UN General Assembly address, the U.S. President had already proposed an exchange of nuclear test observers. In the past, and as recently as April, Soviet diplomacy has frequently requested a halt to all testing. So the latest initiatives are simply a unilateral transposition of the same proposals: Each capital is announcing its implementation of its own proposals without awaiting a quid pro quo, at least for a while.

As in the case of the 6-month halt on SS-20 deployment announced in April, the Soviet nuclear test freeze for a little less 5 months is only of limited significance particularly if, as Washington claims, it is true that the USSR has recently carried out more explosions than usual. One could point to a precedent in this connection in 1958 when Krushchev announced, after a massive series of explosions, a similar but open-ended moratorium. That moratorium was ended 3 years later, in 1961, by Khrushchev himself on the pretext of the Berlin crisis, which the fiery Soviet leader himself sparked off....

True, the USSR is willing to refrain from nuclear tests next year as long as the United States stops its own testing. But this proposal brings us back to an old unresolved problem dating back to the 1963 treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere -- the problem of underground testing. In 1974 Washington and Moscow signed a treaty banning underground explosions with a yield of more than 150 kilotons. That treaty was never ratified although, as with SALT II, both powers generally observe its provisions.

Be that as it may, Washington believes that mutual monitoring is necessary for very low-yield tests. Moscow seemed to accept this argument some years ago when it agreed to the principle of on-site verification in limited cases, preferably by automatic means ("black boxes.") But actually nobody -- especially not France -- seems very keen to relinquish tests very useful for the modernization and miniaturization of their nuclear arsenals.

So the statements of the past few days will doubtless not lead to anything. Nevertheless, it is preferable for the superpowers to compete in the field of peaceful initiatives -- even if they are only verbal -- rather than in the even more futile controversies of the recent past.

CSO: 5200/2729

GENERAL

POLISH HEAD OF STATE SPEAKS ON ARMS RACE, DISARMAMENT TALKS

AU250957 Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU in Polish 23 Jul 85 p 2

[Speech by State Council Chairman Henryk Jablonski at a reception to celebrate Polish national day at the Palace of the Council of Ministers in Warsaw on 22 July]

[Excerpts] Ladies and gentlemen: As a result of historical experience, there is a universal awareness in Poland of the connection between our country's security and development on the one hand, and the structure of world relations on the other. Any war and tension, even if local, damages our national interests. That is why today as well our ambitious domestic aims are accompanied by deep concern over the international situation and by energetic involvement to improve it.

We are witnessing a new stage in the arms race, an increase in military expenditures, and accelerated work on new mass destruction weapons. There is a growing danger that space will be infested with weapons, and the existing strategic balance is threatened with disruption, accompanied by the risk of the worst consequences.

Under these conditions we attach great importance to the new Geneva disarmament talks between the USSR and United States, regarding them as the most important forum of negotiations today. We express our full recognition and support for the constructive stance the USSR has adopted in these talks.

We welcome the agreement between the United States and Soviets concerning a meeting between the leaders of both powers. Just like everyone else to whom the cause of peace is dear, we too hope that the meeting will have positive results.

Energetic, joint activity by all states is also needed to reverse other dangerous trends in the world today: intervention in the domestic affairs of other states, the use of economic strength for the purpose of political blackmail and diktat, transferring ideological differences into international relations, and curbing political dialogue and economic cooperation. All this worsens the international climate and reduces the possibility of honest discussion and joint activity to solve growing world and regional problems.

As a country in the center of Europe, we are keenly interested in removing everything that harms peaceful relations on our continent. It is in this spirit that we celebrated the 40th anniversary of the victory over Hitlerite fascism, for the lessons of World War II should not be forgotten. That is why we are also noting with growing concern the reactivation of revanchist forces in some states and attempts to undermine the Yalta-Potsdam decisions and harm the territorial-political order in Europe. These phenomena are not only a highly dangerous delusion, but also the source of tension and conflicts.

In the sharpened international situation, the Warsaw Pact member-states made the important decision last April to renew this alliance. This took place in our capital, which was almost completely destroyed during the war. This is symbolic. As the chairman of the Polish delegation said, the document that renews the validity of the Warsaw Pact "is an expression of our determination that the primary right of man, the right to live in peace, be guaranteed constantly and effectively."

Consistent in our politics, we declare at the same time our readiness to dissolve the Warsaw Pact should a dissolution of the NATO military bloc occur simultaneously.

CSO: 5200/3076

GENERAL

## EVOLUTION OF POSTWAR POLISH VIEWS ON DISARMAMENT REVIEWED

Warsaw SPRAWY MIEDZYNARODOWE in Polish No 2, Feb 85 pp 7-22

[Article by Dr Wojciech Multan, docent, Polish Institute for International Affairs: "Disarmament in Polish Foreign Policy"]

[Text] A look at the past 40 years of Polish foreign policy leads one to deeper reflection on the actions taken by Polish diplomacy in the international arena, the immediate goal of which was the negotiation of an international agreement on arms limitation and disarmament but in Europe and throughout the world.

### The Place of Military Aspects of International Security in Foreign Policy

Governmental needs and national interests were the main point of departure for establishing reborn Poland's position on the problems of war and peace. This position was formulated in 1947 by Wladyslaw Gomulka who stated: "Supporting a lasting peace between nations is the most important goal of the Polish government's foreign policy and is the principal endeavor of the Polish Worker's Party and the entire Polish nation".<sup>1</sup> The problems of war and peace during the nuclear age are of the greatest importance not only to the Polish people and state but for all of humanity. In 1969, Gomulka stated: "On this field, that of war and peace, is waged a struggle between the forces for socialism and the freedom of nations and the forces of imperialism and reaction. This is a universal struggle for it is taking place all over the world. At the same time, it is a class struggle because it is being waged between the socialist system and the imperialist system, between the world worker and national liberation movement and the capitalist monopolies and the apparatus of force of the imperialist states".<sup>2</sup> This statement most closely characterizes the Polish point of view on war and peace throughout the last 40 years.

Recognizing in full the existence of fundamental differences and rivalry between socialism and capitalism, the Polish People's Republic during the first few years of its existence very strongly resisted the intrusion of these differences into international relations or even more so any attempt to resolve them by the use of force. The peaceful coexistence of states of different social and political order has become the canon of Polish foreign policy. This was the point of departure for our nation's active commitment to

the realization of an ideal whose key element was the elimination of force from international relations and respect for the sovereignty of nations and this ideal was the gradual reduction and military forces and disarmament.

In the discussions on disarmament that took place as early as the first half of the 1950's, Poland presented the idea of the need for peaceful coexistence between states of different political systems. On 4 October 1954 at a debate in the IX General Session of the UN General Assembly, Minister of Foreign Affairs Stanislaw Skrzyszewski said: "Coexistence is a fact that must be considered even by the strongest opponents of any given system. Ever since the socialist order took its place in the world next to capitalism, relations between these systems have become the key problem of international policy...The experience of history denies the claim that the existence of different orders must always lead to war".<sup>3</sup> This idea was supposed to indicate that negotiation and compromise should replace the policy of armament, tension and confrontation. This has become even more obvious now, as Skrzyszewski said, that "no country can any longer count on having a monopoly or an advantage in nuclear weapons or assume that it will be left untouched by war".

Continuing this idea, Minister of Foreign Affairs Adam Rapacki, in a speech before the Sejm Foreign Affairs Commission in December 1957 stated: "Poland feels that one of the most important tasks it faces is to do everything possible to reduce tensions and to encourage constructive coexistence between nations of different forms of government, according to the living interests and ardent aspirations of the people and the need for peace and successful growth of the nation...".<sup>4</sup>

Analysis of the balance of forces in the world in 1950-1960 led Polish leaders to the conclusion that "war can now be avoided but life constantly reminds us that it is possible" and therefore "the historical task of living generations is to make war impossible".<sup>5</sup>

Government needs and national interests were what determined at the outset of Poland's independence that our country would be actively involved in building the foundations for lasting peace and international security both in Europe and throughout the world. For these reasons, at the very birth of the United Nations Organization, Poland identified herself with that organization's program for building a system of collective security and declared her readiness to act with other UN member-nations to keep the peace.<sup>6</sup> These same reasons formed the basis for Poland's opposition to the militarization of international relations. At the 29 April 1946 Plenum of the national People's Council, the vice-minister of foreign affairs said that "Poland is not and does not want to be interested in the existence of any political blocks. To the contrary, the Polish government has more than once expressed its conviction that the division of the world into antagonistic blocks is the greatest danger to the peace and future of the world".<sup>7</sup>

Fairly soon after war, in 1947, the Polish government formulated certain methods for disarmament. At the II Session of the UN General Assembly, Minister of Foreign Affairs Zygmunt Modzelewski stated that: "the practical realization of disarmament can and must be carried out in stages".<sup>8</sup> He also



spoke out for disarmament covering all armed forces and types of arms including nuclear arms.

The concern for our nation's security was the direct cause for the concentrated attention given events in Europe and the undertaking of actions to a system of international security more lasting than one based on the military strength of the two military and political camps dividing our continent into antagonistic halves. Jozef Cyrankiewicz expressed this in his speech before the Sejm in December 1969: "Our special interest in the normalization of political and economic relations in Europe is the result of the supreme directive of the Polish government to give the Polish people peace and security".<sup>9</sup>

It is also worth remembering an event of great significance in international legislation, namely a Polish law introduced in 1948 that called for a lengthy prison sentence for anyone instigating a war of aggression.<sup>10</sup> At that time, Poland also used the forum of the UN to connect the problem of human rights in with the possibility of peaceful coexistence. This could be seen as the origin of the idea of the end of the 1970's of bringing up societies in a spirit of peace.

The second fact is that since the end of World War II, Poland has at least three different times unilaterally reduced its armed forces without any equal "compensation" from the West. These were not the sort of high reductions that could significantly alter the balance of forces in Europe but they did serve as a demonstration of good will. Finally, it is also worth noting that the high priority given actions to limit arms and disarmament showed the interest and commitment of Poland's highest political and government officials.

#### An Attempt to Periodize Polish Disarmament Policy

In principle, the periodization of Polish activity on behalf of disarmament in the international arena does not greatly differ from that of Polish foreign policy in the postwar period inasmuch as the main phases of greater activity and the principal directions were most of all determined by the situation in the international arena. As a general function of foreign policy, Polish activity on behalf of disarmament and its directions in particular have been determined by three factors: 1) the state of East-West relations; 2) changes in the disarmament policy of the western states and especially of the United States and West Germany; 3) and the social and political situation within Poland.

Furthermore, using as our point of departure the forum in which disarmament discussions and negotiations took place and the substance of these talks, we can distinguish the following periods of activity:

Period one, 1946-1947, was characterized by Polish activity on the forum of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Conventional Arms Commission, disarmament negotiation organizations created by the UN. Poland's participation in the work of these organs came from our country's status as a provisional member of the UN Security Council in 1946-1947. This was also the period in which Poland formed its practical skills in disarmament negotiation (and in the UN

General Assembly, discussions on disarmament) in entirely new conditions in which the world was divided into opposed blocks. This fact made already difficult disarmament negotiations much harder. This was also a period in which the socialist nations learned in practical action certain rules for coordinated action. With regard to European affairs, Poland, alarmed by the prospect of the restoration of German militarism, demanded strict and full adherence to the Potsdam Agreement's provisions for demilitarization of Germany.

The second period, 1948-1956, was characterized by an almost total freeze on disarmament talks due to the critical state of international relations, especially East-West relations. Poland took practically no part at all in any disarmament talks but the UN disarmament discussions in which Poland did participate were more propagandistic than realistic in nature. Toward the end of this period, Poland began to prepare a broad program for European disarmament. The reason for Poland's activation in the international arena at this time were the positive changes that began to take place at home in 1956 as well as positive tendencies in East-West relations.

The third period, 1957-1964, seems to have been the period of Poland's greatest activity in disarmament affairs during the entire postwar period. Poland's activity at that time was chiefly directed at reducing armaments and at European disarmament. This was also associated with very widespread activities to realize the Rapacki Plan and later the Gomulka Plan. It was the actions connected with these plans that were supposed to have broader long-term repercussions in the international arena.

The fourth period, 1956-1972, was characterized by the concentrated attention given negotiations in the Geneva Disarmament Committee. In the face of its failure to achieve regional disarmament in Central Europe, Poland saw the possibility of achieving a certain degree of general world disarmament which would for Europe come close to the steps called for in the Rapacki and Gomulka plans. This was obviously aimed at nuclear weapons and the measures proposed by the Polish government were supposed to counter known NATO plans to create multilateral nuclear powers. During these years, much action was also taken by the Geneva Disarmament Committee in which most of the negotiating parties were then active.

The fifth period, 1973-1979, saw the start in 1973 of the Vienna negotiations for reduction of armed forces in Central Europe and other activities such as the Helsinki Conference on European Security. The active part taken by Polish delegations in these negotiations brought about satisfactory results, especially in Helsinki.

The sixth period, the decade of the 1980's, is characterized by a general deadlock in the disarmament dialogue both in Europe and throughout the world at large. In this period, Poland and the other socialist countries tried with only limited success to prevent negative events in international relations and have involved themselves in constructive debates in the Disarmament Committee conferences in Geneva and Vienna and recently in Stockholm.

## Participation in Disarmament Dialogue

It can be said that our country has had rather favorable circumstances for presenting its position on disarmament. Aside from the great states that have usually been represented at every forum of dialogue for disarmament, only Canada can be "boast" of a greater "training period" in this regard. Among the socialist nations, Poland places second after the Soviet Union.

Thus, with regard to its participation in the work of organs involved in the discussion of disarmament, Poland's voice has been heard in the UN General Assembly and the Political Committee. In 1957, Poland joined the UN Disarmament Commission which had been enlarged to 25 members and remained active in it until 1965 when this organ ceased to function. Furthermore, Poland's four-time temporary membership in the Security Council gave our nation the opportunity to speak out on a strategy for disarmament before the nations most responsible for keeping the world peace.

With regard to Poland's participation in the work of organs other than the Atomic Energy Commission and the Conventional Arms Commission working on disarmament negotiations, our country, in support of General Assembly Resolution 1722 of 20 December 1961, joined the Geneva 18-Nation Disarmament Committee. Earlier, in 1959, Poland became a member of this committee when it had been made up of 10 nations. Poland has been a member of all of the incarnations of this organ for multilateral disarmament negotiations.

Relatively often, Poland has been a member of various ad hoc organizations doing work associated with the UN's disarmament activities. These are the Committee for the Peaceful Use of Outer Space, the Committee for Affairs of the World Disarmament Conference, the Scientific Committee for Study of the Effects of Atomic Radiation and many others. Similar in nature were teams of government experts appointed to work on selected problems associated with disarmament negotiations. Polish scientists have participated in the preparation of reports by the UN Secretary General on the effects of the use of atomic, biological and chemical weapons, the economic and social effects of the arms race and the consequences of disarmament. As we know, some of these reports were prepared on Polish initiative and contributed to the successful of needed arms agreements.

With regard to regional disarmament, Poland was active from the very start. Thus, since 1973, our country has participated in the Vienna talks on reducing armed forces and arms in Central Europe and other such enterprises. The specific nature of these talks and their immediate importance to the living interests of our national security has made them a matter of prime importance to Poland. This is also true of the negotiations carried out in the Conference on European Security and Cooperation and especially the Conference on Building Trust, Security and Disarmament in Europe.

A closer examination of the documentation of these negotiations gives one the opinion that Poland has for the last 40 years made generally good use of these forums for dialogue and negotiation to present its own national interests and those of the other states of the socialist community.

## Main Directions of Activity

For Poland, the starting point for its commitment to the disarmament dialogue was its desire to eliminate the use of force from international relations and to create foundations for world security more solid than those offered by military means. It was the drive to reach these goals that has in the last 40 years determined the priorities and main directions of activity in the international arena. The high position given this in Poland's hierarchy of priorities was determined by the degree of danger that this type of weaponry poses for Poland's security and world peace in general. For these reasons, weapons of mass destruction and European armaments head the list of the most important problems. In turn, out of all of the weapons of mass destruction the greatest attention was given to nuclear weapons.

It is worth mentioning at this point that the first disarmament proposal made by Polish diplomacy after World War II concerned nuclear weapons. At the 24 January 1946 meeting of the UN General Assembly, Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs Zygmunt Modzelewski proposed that UN member-nations: a) exchange information on new scientific discoveries; b) use these discoveries for peaceful purposes alone; c) support the concept of fully monitoring the use of atomic energy; d) eliminate all weapons of mass destruction from their arsenals.<sup>11</sup> This proposal was broadened in Ambassador Oskar Lange's speech to the Atomic Energy Commission on 25 June 1946 in which he proposed that: a) a prohibition on the production, possession and use of atomic weapons should be written into the constitutions of UN member-nations; b) an agreement to establish a system to monitor the use of atomic energy should place certain sanctions on states that violate the prohibition against using this form of energy for any other than peaceful purposes.<sup>12</sup> Poland's proposals did not arouse any positive reactions on the part of the western member-states of the Atomic Energy Commission.<sup>13</sup>

In her efforts to totally eliminate nuclear weapons, Poland supported and herself presented proposals for partial steps to limit the growth in number and quality of weapons of mass destruction. The proposed limitations concerned: 1) the use of nuclear weapons; 2) the spread of nuclear weaponry; 3) experimental nuclear weapons testing; 4) and the elimination of these weapons from certain regions.

From the long list of Polish proposals on nuclear arms limitation we can recall: the draft of the 18 October 1952 UN General Assembly resolution to prohibit nuclear weapons<sup>14</sup> and the proposal submitted by Wladyslaw Gomulka to the XV Session of the General Assembly (1960) to freeze the spread of these weapons and the construction of missile installations and bases. The West was much amazed at Gomulka's proposal for an international plebiscite on nuclear weapons.<sup>15</sup>

With regard to the attention given the elimination of weapons of mass destruction, it was an obviously clear priority that disarmament should not be limited just to nuclear weapons. Thus, other weapons of mass destruction such as biological (bacteriological), chemical and radiological weapons have also been at the center of interest of Polish disarmament negotiators. The activity shown by Polish diplomacy in the successful negotiations for a

convention to prohibit biological (bacteriological) weapons and toxins and a draft for a similar convention on chemical weapons are worthy of note. The UN Secretary General's report on the effects of the use of biological and chemical weapons contributed much to the Geneva Disarmament Committee's initiation of negotiations in 1969 to ban biological weapons and toxins and their successful outcome. This report was prepared on the initiative of the Polish delegation and with the active participation of Polish specialists.<sup>16</sup>

A characteristic of the approach taken to a prohibition of these weapons has been the endeavor to prohibit all ABC weapons alike. Later, when the West made it necessary to remove chemical weapons from the convention, a provision was added to the final version of the convention that obligated the signatory states to energetically negotiate the fastest possible agreement eliminating the use of chemical weapons.<sup>17</sup>

Like the other socialist countries, Poland also spoke out for universal total disarmament and during the UN's discussion of programs for realizing this concept introduced many original ideas.<sup>18</sup> The strategy of Poland's activities in the international arena was aimed at universal and total disarmament carried out under strict international supervision. However, it must be admitted that our country fairly quickly became aware of the fact that the realization of this goal would soon become impossible. For that reason, the concept of partial steps for disarmament became very popular in Polish thinking. In Wladyslaw Gomulka's memorable speech to the XV Session of the UN General Assembly, he spoke out clearly for partial disarmament, stating that: "In order to solve these great problems, we must begin with easier and more immediate matters".<sup>19</sup> The proposals made by the Polish leader at that time expressed Poland's philosophy of action both with regard to general world affairs as well as regional European problems. The first steps to be taken were supposed to deal with weapons of mass destruction. The elimination of any possibility for the use of these weapons in the beginning stages of universal and total disarmament "would create a new situation in which further problems of disarmament and the problem of monitoring that disarmament would be easier to achieve".<sup>20</sup> The opposing tendency, i.e. the postponement of the elimination of the newest classes of weapons to the final stage of disarmament might mean that the very disarmament process could become a process for modernizing weapons.

The Polish government's response to the 2 January 1962 letter UN from Secretary General U Thant clearly expressed that government's conviction that universal and total disarmament was its principal goal and declared that every effort must be taken "to carry out steps that would hasten success in reaching an agreement on universal and total disarmament".<sup>21</sup>

The problem of European disarmament has been just as important during the last 40 years. The reasons for the priority given this problem are quite obvious as they have their origin in the historical experiences of the Polish nation and the policy of the NATO states as well as the position taken by West Germany in that policy. All of the actions taken by Poland on behalf of European disarmament were oriented above all at preventing any growth of West German military strength that could endanger Polish security. In the years immediately following World War II, Poland demanded full realization of the

Potsdam Agreement's provisions on the demilitarization of Germany. Later, on West Germany's admission to NATO, Poland spoke out against any growth in the military potential of that state, the equipment of its army with weapons of mass destruction and the stationing on its soil of foreign armies and weapons that might pose a danger to Poland and the other socialist countries. The list of activities undertaken over the last 40 years by Poland on behalf of European disarmament is a very long one. The establishment of a nuclear-free zone in Central Europe (the 1957 Rapacki Plan) and a freeze on the deployment of nuclear weapons in this zone (the 1964 Gomulka Plan) are the most extensively written-about items.

The most important result of the actions taken by Poland and the other socialist countries is unquestionably their prevention of any present or future arming of the West German army with nuclear weaponry. This has been prevented by the Nuclear Nonproliferation Pact that West Germany reluctantly signed in 1975.

Polish initiatives presented to the Vienna negotiations on the reduction of armed forces and weapons in Central Europe must be seen as an attempt to limit the West German Bundeswehr's possibilities for growth. Despite the fact that more than 10 years of talks in Vienna have not been enough to bring about a written disarmament agreement, the present verbal agreements and the very fact that they have continued makes it very possible that there may be achieved an important agreement that can much improve East-West relations. From the Polish point of view, the importance of such an agreement will mainly make itself felt in a reduction of weapons stationed in West Germany.

Finally, it must be noted that Bonn's admission to NATO and the scope of the territory and to some extent the objects of the Vienna negotiations can be seen as indirect recognition by the European states and the great powers of the Polish claim for the need to regard Central Europe as the region of greatest potential danger. Poland's continuing interest in European arms reduction and disarmament has been confirmed by the involvement of Polish negotiators in the preparation in Madrid of a conference on ways to build trust, strengthen security and bring about disarmament as well as Poland's willingness to hold this conference in Warsaw.

#### The Principal Characteristics of Poland's Position on Disarmament Negotiations -- Conclusions

The statements made by Polish delegates to disarmament negotiations over the last 40 years form the basis for certain generalizations on the problems of the matters that are usually brought up during discussion of the chief subjects of negotiations. The ideas formulated by Polish diplomats in the years immediately following World War II and during the first years of the UN have remained relevant up to the present time. At least one of these would be the matter of determining the relationship between the state of international relations and disarmament. It was concluded that progress in disarmament negotiations is possible only under detente and a reduction of tensions between states. However, on the other hand, disarmament itself will lead to an improvement in the political climate and a growth of trust between nations.

We must deal with a similar phenomenon in the relationship that arms policy has to world tension and reduced trust between nations.<sup>22</sup> More than 30 years ago, the Polish government's idea that "the arms race has sharpened the differences between certain states and has led to a serious deterioration of international relations and therefore increased the danger to world peace"<sup>23</sup> was presented at the forum of the UN. This idea has not lost its relevance over the last three decades and it is supported by the entire international community.<sup>24</sup>

In disarmament debates in the international forum, Poland has presented the idea that, for any progress in nuclear disarmament, cooperation between the permanent members of the UN Security Council is necessary. The principal of unanimity in the Security Council has become an obstruction to the work carried out by both the Atomic Energy Commission and the Conventional Arms Commission with regard to the problem of monitoring disarmament. Therefore, the Polish delegation to the III Session of the UN General Assembly presented the Political Committee a draft of a resolution according to which, in an organ created within the Security Council (whose task was to be the supervision and monitoring of the agreement's provisions for reduction of armed forces and weapons), "positive votes by all permanent members of the Security Council" would not be required.<sup>25</sup> Poland, however, opposed any efforts to confer the authority of the Security Council on other organs.<sup>26</sup>

As a rule, the Polish delegation to the negotiations supported drafts for disarmament agreements that contained the most extensive provisions on the obligations placed on signatories. The discussion on an agreement to prohibit biological and chemical weapons is not the only example, but the clearest one of Poland's position in disarmament negotiations.

In situations in which it was at a given moment necessary for tactical reasons to adopt a less radical understanding, Poland insisted on the inclusion of a special clause requiring the treaty signatories to immediately and energetically negotiate a comprehensive prohibition. This is illustrated by discussions on agreements on a ban on nuclear weapons testing, the elimination of biological and chemical weapons and the partial demilitarization of ocean waters, etc.

The matter of provisions regulating any nation's withdrawal from the treaty was partially connected with the problem of which subjects were to be discussed. In the debates that have taken place before the Geneva Disarmament Committee, we can find statements by Polish delegates that oppose any propositions that would fairly easily relieve the signatories from their obligations to the treaty provisions.

Finally, with regard to all of the activities undertaken for arms reduction and disarmament in Europe, we must take notice of a very important attribute of all such proposals. This is the search for foundations for Poland's own lasting security in close connection with the security of other nations, including those belonging to the NATO alliance. It can be said that these formed the germ for thinking in categories of a balance of forces and equal security for both sides and therefore the concept that was to form the main

principle of the Vienna talks. This attribute of the Polish proposals only went unseen by the most bitter opponents of the military stabilization of the European continent.

The Polish delegations were usually strongly allied to the critics of the chief proposals made by Western states calling for excessively strong monitoring of treaty provision observance. This was not in contradiction to the need to monitor the signatories' observance of disarmament provisions but was only a form of opposition to making the provisions for monitoring disarmament the main object of the agreements. Vice-Minister Jozef Winiewicz explained the Polish position by stating that "modern arms technology, its accuracy, speed and great destructive force and the outbreak of an armed conflict exploiting the data gained from inspection of the other side's armaments can become a great temptation for the aggressor".<sup>27</sup> Minister Adam Rapacki said "the existence of nuclear missiles has to a large degree changed the function of monitoring. Weapons monitoring that gives precise information on the location of missile launchers and bases would encourage a possible aggressor to make a surprise attack".<sup>28</sup>

This last element of Minister Rapacki's statement is particularly important and despite the enormous growth that satellite reconnaissance systems have so far undergone, it is still very relevant. For this reason, Minister Rapacki came to the conclusion that it is only total elimination of nuclear weapons and weapon delivery systems that can make possible any atmosphere of trust between nations.

As a principle, the problems of general rather than regional disarmament were always discussed before the Geneva Disarmament Committee. Most often, the discussion was centered on limiting, prohibiting or eliminating certain types of weapons. The statements of Polish delegates have rather consistently approached this problem in a European context of global scope. This was particularly true of the discussions on a nuclear-weapons nonproliferation treaty in which the Polish delegates pointed out the negative consequences of the treaty's provisions on nonproliferation that would allow nations not formally recognized as nuclear powers to maintain nuclear arsenals. In this case, it was a matter of preventing in the future any possibility for West Germany to decide to use nuclear weapons that are formally owned by NATO or any other such international organization.

It is very natural and obvious that delegations taking part in multilateral negotiations will try to gain the support of their own communities for their own proposals. The socialist countries have very often found support for their proposals among the developing nations. On the basis of reading the proceedings of negotiations, it can be seen that the Polish delegations have found special renown among the "third-world" delegations and this has been seen in the fairly frequent use made of statements by Polish delegates and numerous cases in which other delegations rallied around positions taken by Poland. This has also been true of the proceedings that are now under way at the Disarmament Committee Conference in Geneva.

Speaking of Poland's contribution to the cause of arms reduction and disarmament, we can briefly state that this was very great, especially in the



successful negotiation of such agreements as the treaty for a partial ban on nuclear weapons testing, the treaty for partial demilitarization of marine waters or the convention on elimination of bacteriological weapons and toxins. Poland has a beautiful record of actions to limit arms and achieve disarmament in Europe.

In particular, the Polish government's latest variation of the Rapacki Plan contained a series of original solutions, especially the provisions concerning the states in a European nuclear-free zone and the obligations made on the nuclear powers. Poland's arms control proposals were also very original. Thanks to its uniqueness, the Rapacki Plan was an intellectual inspiration in establishing a demilitarized zone in Antarctica and especially a nuclear-free zone in Latin America.<sup>29</sup>

Polish specialists have also achieved a good record in their study of different aspects of weapons and disarmament while participating in various UN research teams. They have also contributed to the development of certain concepts of disarmament that later became a source of inspiration for practical solutions.

As a medium-sized nation territorially, demographically, economically and militarily, Poland has been unable to play a decisive role in the chief disarmament negotiations that took place following World War II. However, this does not mean that our country took a small part in these talks. Its exact role is immeasurable but certain elements are tangible such as its participation in disarmament negotiations and in conferences of government experts, its election to a certain place in the mechanism of disarmament negotiations, etc. Therefore, all of these measurable indicators of a state's position in the continuing disarmament dialogue show that Poland has been more conspicuous than its demographic, territorial, economic and military potential might indicate. This was due to the following reasons:

- the good faith of Polish disarmament propositions and the good faith of our foreign policy in general;
- the extent to which Polish proposals were imbued with the political and military details of the given period of history and region;
- the realistic and nonpropagandistic nature of the majority of Polish proposals and statements;
- Poland's recognition for the need of equal security for all potential signatories of a disarmament agreement;
- the usually high competence and commitment of Polish diplomats participating in disarmament negotiations as well as that of specialists involved in work on certain problems connected with disarmament.

For the Polish delegations to these negotiations, a matter of cardinal importance to the western participants was Poland's alliance to one of the two world powers, the Soviet Union.

For the last 40 years, disarmament has taken a leading place in the activity of the Polish foreign service and the struggle for disarmament has become a field for struggle to realize Poland's national interests in its external security as well as in the building of its international authority. On an international scale, the realization of these interests has become an integral element of the striving to achieve the strategic goal of the entire community of socialist states, i.e. universal total disarmament. This has also been the source of international disarmament activity coordinated with the other socialist countries. This has also expressed the joining of Poland's interests with those of the entire community of socialist countries.

#### NOTES

1. W. Gomulka, "Artykuly i przemowienia" [Articles and speeches], Warsaw, 1964, vol II, p 485.
2. ZBIOR DOKUMENTOW [Collection of documents], 1969, No 5, pp 636-637.
3. Ibid, 1954, No 10, pp 2603-2604.
4. A. Rapacki, "Przemowienia, artykuly, wywiady, 1957-1968" [Speeches, articles and interviews, 1957-1968], Warsaw, 1982, pp 33-43.
5. "Przemowienie ministra A. Rapackiego w debacie general XVI sesji Zgromadzenia Ogolnego ONZ, 9 pazdziernika 1961 roku" [Speech by Minister A. Rapacki during the 9 October 1961 debate at the XVI General Session of the UN General Assembly], ZBIOR DOKUMENTOW, 1961, No 10, pp 1448-1449.
6. See the Declaration of the Government of the Polish People's Republic issued on 16 October 1945 during the signing of the United Nations Charter, ZBIOR DOKUMENTOW, 1945, No 1, PP 45-46.
7. ZBIOR DOKUMENTOW, 1946, No 5, pp 103-114.
8. ZBIOR DOKUMENTOW, 1947-48, No 1-2, pp 35-36.
9. ZBIOR DOKUMENTOW, 1969, No 12, pp 2536-2537.
10. Article 11, Paragraph 1 of the Criminal Code states: "Whoever publicly advocates a war of aggression is subject to five years of imprisonment." DZIENNIK USTAW, 1949, No 45, item 437. See also the 29 December 1950 law on preserving the peace (DZIENNIK USTAW, 1950, No 58, item 521).
11. See "Plenary Meetings of the General Assembly, Verbatim Record", pp 262-263.
12. "United Nations Atomic Energy Commission Official Record of the Third Meeting", pp 42-47.

13. The Polish delegation making these proposals was above all concerned with encouraging within both the UN General Assembly and the Atomic Energy Commission broader discussion of the problem of eliminating nuclear weaponry. Being aware of the arrangement of forces within both of these organs, the delegation for tactical reasons did not strive to quickly end the discussions of this subject.
14. The draft of the resolution "On Preventing the Threat of a New World War and Maintaining Peace and Friendly Cooperation Between Nations" presented to the VII Session of the UN General Assembly called for: 1) reduction within one year of one-third of the armed forces of Security Council members; 2) the presentation of exhaustive data on the armed forces of these same nations; 3) the creation by the Security Council of an international conference for the reduction of the armed forces of all states; 4) a resolution for an unconditional ban on nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction. See "Polski projekt o zapobiegzeniu groźbie wojny światowej wniesiony na VII sesji Zgromadzenia Ogólnego ONZ, Nowy Jork, 18 października 1952 r." [Polish Proposal to Prevent the Threat of World War, introduced at the XII session of the UN General Assembly] and "Rokowania rozbrojeniowe po II wojnie światowej. Wybór dokumentów" [Disarmament Negotiations After World War II. Collection of Documents], Warsaw, 1959, Part 1, pp 298-301.
15. From a speech by Władysław Gomułka, chairman of the Polish delegation, in the general debate at the XV Session of the General Assembly on 27 September, 1960. See "Rokowania rozbrojeniowe..." Part VI, pp 1476-1483. See also "Polski projekt rezolucji w sprawie stworzenia warunków sprzyjających osiągnięciu porozumienia o powszechnym i całkowitym rozbrojeniu, złożony w Komisji Politycznej Zgromadzenia ogólnego ONZ, Nowy Jork, 24 października 1960 r." [Polish Draft of a Resolution to Establish Conditions Favorable to an Agreement on Universal Total Disarmament, submitted to the Political Commission of the UN General Assembly, New York, 24 October 1960] and "Rokowania rozbrojeniowe...", part VI, pp 1524-1527. Furthermore, see "Polski projekt rezolucji w sprawie poinformowania opinii publicznej o skutkach wojny jądrowej, złożony w Komisji Politycznej Zgromadzenia Ogólnego ONZ, Nowy Jork, 21 listopada 1960 r." [Polish Draft of a Resolution on Informing the Public of the Effects of Nuclear War, Submitted to the Political Commission of the UN General Assembly, New York, 21 November 1960] and "Rokowania rozbrojeniowe..." part VI, pp 1550-1553.
16. The draft of such a report was submitted by Poland in 1968.
17. Actually, in the convention banning the testing, production and storage of biological (bacteriological) weapons and toxins and the 16 December 1971 order (Article IX) to destroy them was found the provision: "Every state that is a party to this convention will support the universally recognized effort to successfully ban chemical weapons and for this purpose is ordered to continue in good faith negotiations to as quickly as possible reach an agreement on an effective ban on the testing, production and storage of these weapons, to destroy them and to take necessary measures with regard to devices and conveyances specially designed for the production or use of chemical weapons".

designed for the production or use of chemical weapons".

18. Polish views on the necessary conditions for realizing universal and total disarmament were included in a draft of a General Assembly resolution submitted to that body's Political Commission on 24 October 1960. See "Polski projekt rezolucji w sprawie stworzenia warunkow sprzyjajacych osiagnieciu porozumienia o powszechnym i calkowitym rozbrojeniu, zlozony w Komisji Politycznej Zgromadzenia Ogolnego ONZ, Nowy Jork, 24 pazdziernika 1960 r." [Polish Draft of a Resolution to Create Necessary Conditions for the Reaching of an Agreement on Universal and Total Disarmament, submitted to the Political Commission of the UN General Assembly, New York, 24 October 1960] and "Rokowania rozbrojeniowe...", Part VI, pp 1524-1527.
19. See ZBIOR DOKUMENTOW, 1960, No 10, pp 1624-1625.
20. Speech by Minister A. Rapacki in the general debate of the XVI Session of the UN General Assembly, 9 October 1961. ZBIOR DOKUMENTOW, 1961, No 10, pp 1448-1449.
21. See ZBIOR DOKUMENTOW, 1962, No 3, pp 186-187.
22. See the Polish minister of foreign affair's speech to the VII Session of the General Assembly, 17 October 1952. ZBIOR DOKUMENTOW, 1953, No 1, pp 40-41.
23. Speech by the Polish minister of foreign affair to the UN General Assembly Political Committee, 9 April 1953. ZBIOR DOKUMENTOW, 1953, No 5, pp 985-986.
24. See the Final Document of the UN General Assembly's X Special Session on disarmament. ZBIOR DOKUMENTOW, 1978, No 10, pp 158-182.
25. See Ambassador S. Wierblowski's speech during the general debate of the III Session of the UN General Assembly on 5 December 1949. ZBIOR DOKUMENTOW, 1950, No 1, pp 3-4.
26. In 1952, during the UN General Assembly Political Committee's discussion of a report by the so-called Collective Means Committee, Poland spoke out very strongly against any violations of the UN Charter. See Vice-Minister S. Wierblowski's 16 January 1952 speech to the Political Committee. ZBIOR DOKUMENTOW, 1952, No 3, pp 1029-1030.
27. Vice-Minister Jozef Winiewicz's 27 November 1961 speech to the UN General Assembly Political Committee. ZBIOR DOKUMENTOW, 1961, No 11, pp 1029-1030.
28. See Minister A. Rapacki's 21 March 1962 speech at the plenary session of the 18-Nation Disarmament Committee. ZBIOR DOKUMENTOW, 1962, No 3, pp 315-316.
29. For more on the importance of the Rapacki Plan, see W. Multan's "The Rapacki Plan from the Perspective of a Quarter-Century", INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS. STUDIES OF THE PISM, 1984, No 1, pp 75-98.

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR BRIEFS KOHL ON SECOND ROUND GENEVA TALKS

LD311621 Hamburg DPA in German 1412 GMT 31 Jul 85

[Excerpt] Bonn, 31 Jul (DPA) -- The Soviet Government has informed Chancellor Helmut Kohl separately about the course of the second round of the Soviet-U.S. arms control negotiations in Geneva. As government spokesman Friedhelm Ost told the press in Bonn on Wednesday, Vladislav Terekhov, the Soviet charge d'affaires, handed over a memorandum to this effect in the Chancellor's Office.

Information like this from the Soviets, of a confidential character, also came from the Soviet Government after the first round of negotiations Ost said. It made it easier for the Federal Government to gain a comprehensive impression of the position and development of the Geneva negotiations, especially as constant and intensive consultations between the Federal Government and the United States were taking place in the framework of the alliance.

On the latest Soviet-U.S. discussion on the issue of nuclear tests, Hans Gnodke, Foreign Ministry spokesman stressed to the press that the Federal Government supports all steps which lead to a comprehensive test ban agreement. The most important unsolved problem is verification of the limitation of underground tests.

The Federal Government sees in U.S. President Ronald Reagan's invitation to observers to an underground U.S. nuclear test -- a measure rejected by the Soviet Union -- a step towards giving a new momentum to the efforts to solve the verification issue. Bonn expects a constructive response from the Soviet Union to the U.S. offer in this spirit.

On the other hand, the limited halt to all nuclear tests announced by Soviet party head Mikhail Gorbachev immediately after a series of tests does not provide for any opportunity for verification, the spokesman stressed. This, therefore, does not contribute to the solution of this problem.

CSO: 5200/2732

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

NAKASONE WELCOMES REAGAN-GORBACHEV MEETING

OW030315 Tokyo KYODO in English 0305 GMT 3 Jul 85

[Text] Tokyo, 3 Jul (KYODO)--Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone Wednesday welcomed reports that a meeting between U.S. President Ronald Reagan and Soviet party chief Mikhail Gorbachev has been slated for November in Geneva. "I've been calling for a meeting, and I'm glad that one is to take place," Nakasone told reporters. "Talking face-to-face and getting to know each other will offer an opportunity to reduce tension (between the U.S. and Soviet blocs)," he added.

Chief Cabinet Secretary Takao Fujinami echoed Nakasone, saying the Reagan-Gorbachev meeting will be important for world peace and will help moves toward disarmament. Reagan and Gorbachev will reportedly meet 19-21 November, the first top-level U.S.-Soviet summit since June 1979 when Jimmy Carter and Leonid Brezhnev met in Vienna. An official announcement of their meeting is expected in a few days.

CSO: 5260/6

SPACE ARMS

USSR: UKRAINIAN JOURNAL HITS U.S. POLICY ON SPACE ARMS

Kiev KOMMUNIST UKRAINY in Russian No 5, May 85 pp 68-76

[Article by Yuriy Kuzmich Golovanev, member of editorial board, chief of department of theory and practice of management of the national economy of the journal KOMMUNIST UKRAINY, candidate of economic sciences, under the rubric "On International Topics": "Space Must Remain Peaceful"]

[Text] Problems of a social-political, technical-economic and natural character touching on the destinies of all countries and peoples have been having a more and more perceptible influence on the entire course of world development in the last decades of the 20th century. Further social progress and the future of civilization depend to a considerable extent on their effective resolution. The problem of study and development of outer space for peaceful purposes for the welfare of all mankind holds an important place along with those such as the prevention of war, curbing of the arms race, the provision of food products, raw materials and energy to the ever-growing population, environmental protection, and a number of other problems.

The Soviet Union's launch of the first artificial earth satellite in October 1957 and Yuriy Gagarin's space flight aboard the Vostok spacecraft were a very great victory of the human intellect and marked the beginning of the space era and man's development of what was for him a new sphere of practical endeavor. This epochal event serves as still further vivid evidence of the advantage of the socialist social system over the capitalist system, the triumph of its science and technology, and the genuine progress of its culture.

Now more than 100 states are taking part in implementing national and international space programs. People have penetrated into near-earth space and have approached planets of the solar system with the help of automatic equipment and other means of space technology. In essence, a "cosmization" of their activity is occurring, and this process is endless, as are the universe and the progress of mankind.

The international public highly valued the results of history's longest 237-day orbital flight of three Soviet cosmonauts, L. Kizim, V. Solovyev and O. Atkov aboard the Salyut-7/Soyuz scientific research complex, which ended successfully on 2 October 1984. In the greeting to scientists, designers, engineers, technicians, and all collectives and organizations which took part

in preparing and carrying out this flight, the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the USSR Council of Ministers noted that this new success of Soviet cosmonautics was a worthy contribution to accomplishment of tasks of the 11th Five-Year Plan outlined by the 26th party congress for the further study and development of outer space. It clearly attests to the high effectiveness of Soviet space systems and to the Soviet Union's desire to use space for peaceful purposes.

The development of space, which has become a symbol of the victory of human intellect over the forces of nature, opened up new opportunities for studying Earth and the universe and for accelerating social-economic and scientific-technical progress, and it permitted fuller comprehension of the importance of a global approach to the study of phenomena and processes on a planetary scale and to the use of the "sixth ocean" in the interests of all countries and peoples.

The development of cosmonautics promoted the establishment of new fields of knowledge and a fundamentally new sector of industry which produces vehicles, instruments, equipment and other components of the space infrastructure. Although the solution to practical problems of the development of near-earth space aimed at implementing important national economic tasks and scientific understanding of the world around us is fundamental at the present stage, the studies and experiments oriented toward mankind's future and bearing economic and social blessings for him remain paramount.

Meanwhile, the danger has arisen that space will be turned into an arena of a potential nuclear war with far-reaching consequences. CPSU Central Committee General Secretary, Comrade M. S. Gorbachev remarked at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on 11 March 1985: "Never before has such a terrible threat hung over mankind as in our days. The only reasonable solution to the present situation is an understanding of opposing forces on the immediate cessation of the arms race on Earth, and the nuclear arms race above all, and keeping it out of space."

Unfortunately it must be stated that in recent years, as the space aspect of the arms race became a component part of the foreign policy strategy of U.S. policymakers aimed at establishing the potential for waging nuclear war, the prospects of space being turned into yet another sphere of military threat to all living beings on Earth began to stand out more and more tangibly.

V. I. Lenin remarked in 1916 that "'world domination' is, in short, the content of imperialist policy" ("Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy" [Complete Collected Works], Vol 30, p 85). The world has changed since then, but imperialism's aggressive essence has not changed. The space programs of the principal world imperialist power, the United States of America, also should be viewed specifically in the light of claims to world domination. While at an early stage of implementation those programs were a means of accomplishing specific military strategic missions, as Washington's global ambitions grew the programs were transformed into an inalienable tool of American foreign policy, into a "new means of strengthening the role of the United States as a world power."



It is no secret that Washington began the latest round of the arms race (this time in space) far from all at once and, moreover, not from scratch. The bosses of military business prepared for this little by little together with representatives of political power. It is apropos to recall in this connection that with the opening of the space era by the Land of Soviets back in the 1950's the largest American corporations began secret research and development aimed at militarization of outer space. This concerns in particular the Spacetrack and Saint programs worked out in the late 1950's and early 1960's which provided for the establishment of a network of missile-armed satellites for destroying enemy missiles at the moment of their launch, as well as "satellite-killers" of space objects, and it concerns the decision made by the White House in the late 1960's to deploy the Safeguard ballistic missile defense system, and other matters.

As the drug of antisovietism acted, military-space fever intensified in the United States from year to year and gained an increasingly ominous character. The U.S. administration, which enlisted the support of the extreme right wing of the military-industrial complex, set a course toward "rearming America" in the early 1980's. Space was called the principal potential springboard for possible combat actions, and this hardly was done by chance. Divulging the secret schemes of its country's aggressive circles, the journal BUSINESS WEEK wrote in one of its issues: "The one who is able to seize control over space--this principal arena of future wars--will be able to change the correlation of forces in such a decisive manner that it will be tantamount to the establishment of world domination" (BUSINESS WEEK, 4 June 1979, p 136).

Today American political figures speak openly about "star wars" plans as of something which goes without saying. They hope that by giving the United States absolute superiority in military-space engineering and technology they thus will succeed in outstripping the Soviet Union in this sphere and changing the existing overall military-strategic balance in their favor.

The aggressive aspirations of the latter-day crusaders were reflected in a number of official government documents, including Pentagon directives in the area of defense for the period 1984-1988, in the presidential directive on national space policy published by the White House in the summer of 1982, and in the "strategic defense initiative" announced by the president in March 1983--a broad program for the "conquest of space" providing for establishment of a mass ground-based and space-based ballistic missile defense system, implementation of which was sanctioned by the president in early March 1984 by special Directive No 119. The "Report to Congress on U.S. Policy in Control of Antisatellite Weapons" dated 31 March 1984 also serves as evidence of Washington's widescale preparations for the militarization of outer space.

A new step along the path toward militarization of outer space was taken by official Washington circles in late 1984. This concerns the decision to establish a joint space command in the Pentagon subordinate to the secretary of defense, concentrating in the same hands direction over military activities in outer space and exercising control over military satellites as well as shuttle flights by American craft.

A component part of the program for building up the U.S. military potential is the development of space means of warfare and the Pentagon's intention to place fundamentally new kinds of weapons (laser, beam, and others) in a near-earth orbit with the idea of using them to destroy space objects and enemy missiles being launched, knocking out communications and control systems, disrupting air and ground traffic on enemy territory, and so on.

The development of fundamentally new kinds of space weapons not only signifies an improvement in the technical means of warfare, but also promotes a colossal growth in military expenditures. The flywheel of the "star arms" is just starting to gather speed, but beginning as early as the 1950's the United States spent almost \$60 billion on the militarization of space. During the period 1983-1984 these expenditures were \$8.5 and \$9.3 billion respectively, and in 1985 they will approach almost \$13 billion.

According to the Pentagon's concept, the ground-based and space-based ballistic missile defense system should become the most important element of the strategic complex of a nuclear first strike. And it is specifically for this purpose, circumventing the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems (which prohibits the development, testing or deployment of anti-ballistic missile systems based in space, at sea and elsewhere, and the deployment of ballistic missile defense systems outside the national territory of the two powers), that the United States now is carrying on work of developing mobile ballistic missile defense radars. New missile systems are being tested and multiple-warhead vehicles for the anti-ballistic missiles are being developed for these same purposes. Approval of the ASAT anti-ballistic missile system now being carried out in the United States represents a serious danger. It is based on the high-altitude F-16 fighter equipped with missiles for the destruction of space objects. Two flight tests of the system were conducted in 1984.

Having set the goal of developing a certain "one hundred percent defense system," a kind of "U.S. security cap" or a "space umbrella," Pentagon strategists found fervent adherents for this in the person of official Washington circles. Suffice it to note that it is planned to spend \$26 billion over the next five years just for exploratory work to develop a "comprehensive ballistic missile defense system." But this is only the beginning: specialists estimate that implementation of the entire program will cost \$500-2,000 billion.

The question arises in this regard: How realistic are the hopes of the U.S. leadership for developing a certain "impenetrable shield" against nuclear missiles? It is absolutely clear from an economic standpoint that practical implementation of the military's plans will cost the American taxpayers truly "cosmic expenses." On the other hand, it will bring fabulous profits for the military-industrial monopolies. And with regard to the so-called "impenetrable" defense system making it possible to take shelter from inevitable retaliation, it must be said frankly here that this idea is illusory, unpromising and simply devoid of elementary sense. Scientists have given repeated reminders of this. For example, the "Declaration on Prevention of War" adopted at a conference of scientists representing 36 national academies of sciences,

including those of the four nuclear powers--the USSR, United States, France and Great Britain--held in Rome in September 1982 stated frankly that there is no prospect for making a defense effective enough for protection of cities inasmuch as even one nuclear warhead which penetrates can cause mass destruction.

The majority of American military specialists, civilian experts and political figures also consider the concept of a space defense to be basically unsuitable. The report entitled "Space-Based Ballistic Missile Defense" prepared by the "Union of Concerned Scientists"--a nongovernmental U.S. organization--states frankly that an "ideal" ballistic missile defense system cannot be developed now and most likely cannot ever be developed. The authors further write that plans for developing it will lead to an escalation of offensive arms, undermine arms limitation treaties and make peace more fragile. Specialists from the U.S. Congressional Office of Technology Assessment echo them: "Not one ballistic missile defense system can be made reliable." All its elements are vulnerable to a broad range of countermeasures which will cost comparatively little to develop.

Representatives of American strategic thought lately have been trying to make adjustments to a very shaky argumentation of the thesis of the "absolute impenetrability" of a space-based ballistic missile defense. They are circulating the version that although its deployment may not fully assure protection of national territory against a retaliatory strike, it "would increase the degree of uncertainty" for the enemy and will hinder strategic military planning and adoption of appropriate measures of a defensive nature.

But this thesis too is groundless, and here is why. If the given widely advertised ballistic missile defense system is not "absolutely impenetrable," then the question arises as to the advisability of its development at all. Secondly, the so-called "uncertainty factor" touches on the security of the United States itself to an equal extent and in no way will it give Washington the expected advantages.

Assertions of Washington politicians that the presence of a space defense allegedly will strengthen international security also do not conform to reality. A "space bludgeon" over the head of mankind will make life more stressful and dangerous and will not strengthen, but will undermine national and international security. The new "defense system" planned by the Pentagon, allegedly designed for an "absolutely reliable aversion of a counterstrike," in fact may become a temptation for delivering a nuclear first strike, with far-reaching consequences for mankind.

The space mirage so bewitched Washington doctrinaires that they undertook to prove in every way that the "defense initiative" advanced by the United States would be a blessing to the country, it would actually reduce the danger of thermonuclear war and, in the final account, it would lead to no less than the salvation of all mankind. One must remember in this regard that there also were pretenders to the role of "saviors of mankind" earlier, but it is true that then they worshipped another fetish--the atomic bomb.

Let's refer to facts from the history of World War II, and particularly the course of discussion of the issue about use of atomic bombs against a practically defeated Japan. A report to President H. Truman by then U.S. Secretary of War H. Stimson, a fierce adherent of the use of nuclear weapons, stated frankly: "If the problem of proper employment of atomic weapons can be solved, we (the United States--Yu. G.) will have an opportunity to create a situation on Earth in which the world in general and our civilization will be saved" (Roshchin, A. A., "Mezhdunarodnaya bezopasnost' i yadernoye oruzhiye" [International Security and Nuclear Weapons], Moscow, Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya, 1980, p 33). It is generally known how the solution to this problem by American imperialism ended for residents of the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The situation for inhabitants of the planet also did not become at all safe inasmuch as nuclear weapons continue to be the principal argument in the aggressive politics conducted by imperialist circles. The world public is coming to an ever greater realization that space attack weapons in the hands of Pentagon strategists also will serve as a potential means for blackmailing other states and peoples and as a source of increased danger for all mankind.

It is quite obvious that it is not the salvation of mankind over which U.S. leaders have to be concerned today. No one begged them for this or selected them as rulers of the destinies of other states and peoples. They should think more about the destiny of their own people inasmuch as they are making their lives far from safe with their unreasonable actions. The build-up in the arms race and its extension even to outer space are in the final account a threat to the United States' own security.

To justify their aggressive plans the "star wars" apologists advance various kinds of far-fetched excuses about the U.S. lag behind the USSR in space research and development, about the defensive nature of American space programs and the "aggressive Soviet space doctrine," and about the need to strengthen national security and maintain peace throughout the world by building up their own military space potential. Theses are exaggerated concerning allegedly existing difficulties in verifying the observance of agreements on the exclusion of militarization of outer space.

In an attempt to divert public attention from the pernicious policy being followed, all levels of the U.S. propaganda machine joined widely in a campaign to advertise the need for establishing an "American space fortress" and a "space shield for America." Space was declared as one more sphere of "vital interests" where Pentagon strategists intended to draw new boundaries of the American empire.

It is unbelievable, but it is a fact: the White House circulated a position that "disarmament on Earth can be achieved only through domination in space." They thus wish to accustom inhabitants of the country, to the lulling discourse of political leaders, to the idea of the need for waging victorious space wars, and they attempt to eliminate from their consciousness the hope of attaining comprehensive understandings on a freeze and subsequent reduction in the states' nuclear arsenals. How can we not help but recall Lenin's

statement here to the effect that "deception of the masses of people is developed artistically" in a capitalist state with respect to foreign policy "affairs" ("Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy," Vol 32, p 335).

As repeatedly noted in Communist Party and Soviet state documents, any attempt by aggressive imperialist circles to acquire the potential of delivering a disarming strike are doomed to failure. There cannot be any suggestion of any attainment of superiority under conditions of the strategic military balance between socialism and imperialism. The socialist community has everything necessary to rebuff the aggressive attacks by the enemies of peace and social progress. The development of any kind of weapon, including space weapons, will involve a response by the other side, as already occurred earlier with respect to other kinds of combat equipment.

It is also not worthwhile to rest hopes on development of a mythical "super-weapon" from which there allegedly is no protection and there will be no protection and which can be used to "depreciate" the Soviet military potential. One thing remains: to realize that inasmuch as a pursuit of the chimera of military superiority is senseless, it is enormously more sensible today to come to an agreement on a mutual and verifiable "freeze" at a certain level of those weapons which are not yet deployed, to cease development of new kinds and systems of weapons, and subsequently to begin their reduction.

Regarding the position of the "impossibility of verification" of the fulfillment of space agreements, which is announced in a special Congressional report on U.S. policy on verification of antisatellite weapons as being almost the principal ground for the Washington administration's refusal to achieve agreement with the USSR on the question of banning such weapons, this too does not conform to reality. Such verification is possible and will be very effective inasmuch as the technical means for space and electronic surveillance at the disposal of states today as well as the assets located in various media--on land, in the ocean and in space--guarantee each party's fulfillment of its obligations. This opinion both of Soviet experts and of their western colleagues causes no doubt in anyone, with the exception of some American political leaders, who see in the position on the "impossibility of verification" an opportunity to lull public vigilance, to stretch out resolution of this question for an indeterminate period, and meanwhile to accelerate the build-up of their space arsenal.

U.S. official representatives also took a negative position regarding USSR proposals to declare a moratorium on testing and deploying antisatellite and any other space weapons. Completely unfounded statements are advanced to the effect that the United States first has to catch up with the Russians and only then talk about a moratorium. It shouldn't be forgotten, however, that space is not a track-and-field arena and we do not intend to compete here inasmuch as we realize that the overall results of such "competition" will be the destruction of civilization. In addition, everyone knows that it is not the Soviet Union, but specifically the United States which deployed two antisatellite systems back in the 1960's on Kwajalein and Johnston atolls--systems which can be reactivated today. It is no secret for anyone that the American

reusable Shuttle spacecraft, the Titan missiles and certain other U.S. combat systems also have antisatellite capabilities.

And finally a word about Washington administration statements about a certain "rigid position" taken by the USSR at the space talks. Without going into detail it should be noted frankly that our position on this question is clear and unambiguous. This is indicated by initiatives of the Land of Soviets at international forums, official statements by party and state leaders, and those important draft treaties which the USSR introduced to the United Nations and which now guide states in their endeavor, including in the study and development of outer space. Other evidence of this is the obligation unilaterally assumed by the USSR not to place any antisatellite weapon in space for so long as other states refrain from such actions.

Our country's consistent position is reflected in the draft resolution "Use of Outer Space Exclusively for Peaceful Purposes and the Welfare of Mankind" submitted for consideration at the XXXIX Session of the UN General Assembly. In a letter to UN Secretary General J. Perez de Cuellar, Comrade A. A. Gromyko, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, stated: "The Soviet Union believes that it is important now as never before for the exclusion of space from the sphere of the arms race to become a strict rule of state policy and a generally recognized international obligation and for all channels for the militarization of outer space without exception to be reliably closed."

The basic direction and substance of proposals advanced by our country were reflected in the resolution adopted by the UN General Assembly on 12 December 1984, in which the supreme international forum for the first time clearly registered the need for refusal by states to use force in space and which affirmed that general and complete disarmament under effective international control requires that outer space be used exclusively for peaceful purposes and that it not become an arena for the arms race. The General Assembly called on all states to actively promote the attainment of goals of the peaceful use of space and adoption of immediate measures for preventing the arms race in this sphere in the interests of maintaining international peace and security and developing cooperation and mutual understanding. The resolution also contains an appeal to the USSR and United States, which have large space potentials, to begin talks immediately in a constructive spirit aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space. (It must be noted here that the delegations of 150 states were for adoption of the resolution and only the U.S. delegation set itself in opposition to this declaration of intention of the supreme international forum.)

The substance of differences in approaches of the USSR and United States to the question of space arms was most clearly expressed at a meeting held in Geneva during 7-8 January 1985 between A. A. Gromyko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, and U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz. At the meeting the American side tried to sidestep the problem of preventing the militarization of outer space by limiting itself to discussing

only those kinds of arms about which talks already had been held earlier-- strategic arms and medium-range nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union believed and continues to believe that it is impossible to consider questions of strategic nuclear arms and medium-range nuclear weapons without considering the question of preventing an arms race in outer space, and that these three problems should be considered as a package, i.e., in their interrelationship.

The understanding reached during the meeting concerning the subject and objectives of new Soviet-American talks on a set of interrelated issues regarding space and nuclear arms is of great importance. The USSR's approach to these talks is well known. "I would like our partners at the Geneva talks to understand the Soviet Union's position and to reciprocate. Then agreement would become possible. Peoples of the world would sigh with relief," emphasized Comrade M. S. Gorbachev at the March 1985 CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

In an attempt to create a favorable atmosphere for the talks which had begun, the Soviet Union recently proposed that the USSR and United States impose a moratorium on development, including scientific research, testing and deployment of space attack arms, and freeze their strategic offensive arms for the entire period of the talks. Deployment of American medium-range missiles in Europe and accordingly the build-up in Soviet retaliatory measures must be terminated at the same time. In a demonstration of good will, the USSR is placing a moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles and is suspending implementation of other retaliatory measures in Europe.

Lenin taught that "politics has its objective logic independent of the plans of particular persons or parties" ("Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy," Vol 14, p 190). Kindling an atmosphere of fear, enmity and mistrust as well as other negative emotions comprises the worst methods in politics. It is also apropos in this regard to remember who is attempting to turn militant anticommunism into a cornerstone of American politics, and the words of one of the founders of the United States, G. Washington, to the effect that "a country which permits itself to experience constant hatred of any country becomes the slave of its own hostility."

Speaking at a meeting with members of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee of the U.S. Congress, Comrade V. V. Shcherbitskiy, head of the delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, remarked: "The immutable truth of the nuclear age is that an arms race cannot genuinely assure anyone's security. Strict observance of the principle of equality and equal security is necessary for normal relations. It stands to reason that this presumes parties' readiness for reasonable compromise. This is the only possible approach." Realistically thinking representatives of the capitalist world are realizing more and more that a sober understanding of the existing situation is the important factor today. The situation is that the assurance of mankind's future depends largely on whether space will remain peaceful or, conversely, its saturation with various kinds of weapons will unfold. A policy aimed at protecting space against the deployment of weapons there must be a mandatory standard of state conduct now.

The role and importance of the United Nations is increasing (although some in the West would like to assure everyone of the opposite) with the aggravation of the world situation through the fault of imperialist circles. The United Nations is called upon to raise its voice for a most rapid attainment of agreements through talks guaranteeing that space is kept peaceful. There is also great importance in establishing world public opinion in favor of concluding comprehensive agreements on banning the testing and deployment of any weapon in space and in activating efforts to disseminate objective and truthful information about the consequences of an arms race in outer space.

An expansion of international cooperation in the study and development of space is assuming more and more urgent importance. Experience already has built up in unifying the states' efforts in this area, including in the development and placement of spacecraft in orbit, the conduct of international scientific-technical experiments and studies, joint flights by astronauts of various countries, and so on. The Soviet Union is setting the example here. True to Lenin's peaceloving policy, it considers the development of space to be a matter for all mankind and it is carrying on broad cooperation within the scope of space programs both with fraternal countries of the socialist community and with capitalist states. Over the 27 year period of developing the "sixth ocean," the Soviet Union has made 56 manned space flights in which 58 Soviet and 11 foreign cosmonauts took part. USSR scientists made an enormous contribution, together with specialists of the United States, Canada and France, to the development of a space system for searching for ships and aircraft in distress (KOSPAS-SARSAT), which has helped save the lives of hundreds of citizens of different states.

The launch on 15 December 1984 of the Vega-1 automatic interplanetary station of the Venus-Halley's Comet space project is new evidence of our country's desire for multilateral cooperation in studying outer space and planets of the solar system. Scientists and specialists of Austria, Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, France, the FRG and Czechoslovakia took part in developing the set of scientific gear and equipment together with Soviet scientists, designers, engineers and technicians.

Our country is giving unselfish help to other states in studying and using space for the good of mankind. All this is a vivid demonstration that effective use of the achievements of the scientific-technical revolution for man's sake is possible only under conditions of socialism, since this social system, devoid of social antagonisms and limitations, opens up favorable opportunities for man's interaction with his environment.

But the practical implementation of joint international projects and programs in the development of outer space will be successful only if there is a radical reduction in military expenditures and if a climate of trust is established among states. The experience of history is calling as never before for a unity of actions of all forces of peace, democracy, progress and political realism which are capable of placing a reliable barrier in the path of proliferation of the arms race and of disrupting plans of imperialism's militant circles. Our optimism is based on an understanding of those enormous capabilities contained in the peaceloving potential of mankind. Our optimism rests



on the might and unity of countries of the socialist community and on the solidarity of their communist and working parties. Our optimism is based on the very logic of historical development and on an understanding that termination of the arms race and peaceful coexistence are a demand of the time and an urgent need for which everyone must strive today.

COPYRIGHT: IZDATELSTVO "RADYANSKA UKRAINA" "KOMMUNIST UKRAINY" 1985.

6904

CSO: 5200/1303

SPACE ARMS

FRG FIRM ANNOUNCES PARTICIPATION IN SDI PROGRAM

DW261202 Bonn DIE WELT in German 26 Jul 85 p 11

[Dankward Seitz article: "Astronautics at the Beginning of a New Era"]

[Excerpts] Munich -- After years of a turnover stagnation at the legal of roughly DM5.7 the Ottabrunn-based Messerschmitt-Boelkow-Blohm GMBH (MBB) is anticipating a distinct increase of an average 10 percent annually as of 1986. According to Hans Arnt Vogels, chairman of the MBB management, this will be largely attributable to the research and development activities of the biggest FRG aeronautics and astronautics firm. Vogels described the U.S. SDI program as a "very interesting technological project," in which MBB will participate without a political decision made by Bonn. At present, he said, possibilities are being examined for acquiring orders, commensurate with the firm's performance capacities, from corresponding U.S. authorities and U.S. firms.

CSO: 5200/2729

SPACE ARMS

FRG FOREIGN MINISTER VIEWS 'STAR WARS,' EUREKA, DETENTE

LD271104 Hamburg DPA in German 1006 GMT 27 Jul 85

[Text] Landshut, 27 Jul (DPA) -- Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher (FDP) has again spoken in favor of a "European response to the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI]." A European problem is at issue and therefore the Federal Republic has every reason to take the French offer seriously and work closely with Paris in security policy, Genscher said today at an FDP regional congress in Landshut. It is not a question of a conflict with the Atlantic alliance. Rather, the latter should be strengthened through a "European pillar which deserves the name, and not through many small European pillars."

Genscher said the importance of cooperation with France is also shown by the Eureka project, which serves exclusively civilian goals. It is an investment in the future "which is in fact comparable only with the Marshal Plan after World War II." Europe must not become "the U.S. licensee," but must be an equal partner. Talk about Europe's demise is contradicted by the fact that within 3 months, Austria, Switzerland, Sweden, Norway and Finland, as well as the 10 EC states decided to cooperate on Eureka.

Genscher underlined his demand for a new phase of detente policy instead of renewed confrontation in East-West relations, a demand which has been criticized in the Bonn coalition -- particularly by the CSU -- which points out that new points of emphasis are clearly recognizable in the Soviet foreign policy. In this phase it is important for the Federal Republic to play an active, formative and determining role.

CSO: 5200/2729

SPACE ARMS

FRG GOVERNMENT SPOKESMAN VIEWS SDI PARTICIPATION

LD311615 Hamburg DPA in German 1445 GMT 31 Jul 85

[Text] Bonn, 31 Jul (DPA) -- The Federal Government will decide on the form and terms of possible cooperation with the United States in the research project for the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) only after a visit to the United States in September by a delegation of FRG experts. Government spokesman Friedhelm Ost said today that the delegation will comprise members of the Federal Government and industrialists.

He was replying to questions in connection with reports that Richard Perle of the U.S. Defense Department had told a meeting at the Konrad Adenauer Foundation in Bonn that Washington expects an outline agreement with the Federal Government on FRG SDI participation by the end of the year. Ost said an outline agreement with the United States is one of several options which the Federal Government will examine.

Bonn regards such an agreement as possible and possibly useful but does not think it essential to FRG research participation. In a free economy, industry can conclude contracts on individual research projects independently of the government. The important question is whether agreements can be reached with the United States which will facilitate arrangements favorable to FRG industry.

SPD politician Egon Bahr today criticized the statement attributed to Perle. Bahr asked the Federal Government: Have we already become a banana republic to the extent that a Pentagon assistant secretary of state announces important FRG political decisions?

CSO: 5200/2731

SPACE ARMS

FRG'S MISCHNICK NOTES GDR 'INTEREST' IN EUREKA

LD021309 Hamburg DPA in German 1117 GMT 2 Aug 85

[Excerpt] Bonn, 2 Aug (DPA) -- According to Wolfgang Mischnick, chairman of the FDP parliamentary party, the GDR has signaled its interest in cooperating with the Federal Republic in the Eureka joint West European Research project. In an article for the AUGSBURGER ALLGEMEINE published today by the FDP parliamentary party, Mischnick describes this as a positive development. Better cooperation between the two German states in the field of technology or in environmental protection make sense.

Those relevant government authorities who were available on Friday afternoon said they knew nothing about it. The Intra-German Ministry said the GDR's interest in participating in the technological development was known. However, no concrete concepts exist regarding Eureka.

CSO: 5200/2731

SPACE ARMS

FRG'S STRAUSS INTERVIEWED ON 'STAR WARS'

AU262054 Vienna Television Service in German 1930 GMT 26 Jul 85

[Interview given by Franz Josef Strauss, CSU Chairman and Bavarian minister president to ORF correspondent Klaus Emmerich during the International Democratic Union session in Washington, date not given]

[Text] [No question as received] [Strauss] So far, there exists no useful alternative to the strategy of nuclear deterrence. Unilateral disarmament or grasping for the sword -- these are no alternatives. The hope that the Soviet policy will abruptly change is also unrealistic; we thus need an alternative. The only conceivable alternative -- no one knows today whether it will be successful or not -- is the push forward into a new technological dimension. This new technological dimension should make it possible to blunt the edge of offensive weapons and reduce their importance, without oneself having to rely on the use of nuclear weapons. Besides, the research will yield scientific-technological findings with a capacity for economic utilization that will most likely stretch far into the next century. But even if the Europeans will not participate, the United States has already started the project, has made initial advances, and will not be dissuaded by us.

CSO: 5200/2729

SPACE ARMS

FRENCH FOREIGN MINISTER DUMAS ON FINNISH EUREKA ROLE

LD012059 Helsinki International Service in Finnish 1500 GMT 1 Aug 85

[Text] According to French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas, political reservations were not expressed when France obtained the approval of its EEC partners for Finland's participation in West European high technology cooperation. Seppo Toivonen spoke with the French foreign minister.

In connection with the CSCE meeting, France has conducted talks with Finland on, among others, advancing the West European high technology cooperation project, Eureka. In a statement given to the radio news, Foreign Minister Roland Dumas said that for both political and technical reasons, France set out to support Finland's entry into Eureka. In Dumas' words, Finland is a highly developed country technologically and it therefore has a role in Eureka.

The press has hinted that some countries have reservations about Finland's entry, specifically because of its extensive trade with the Soviet Union. When asked whether these were expressed when Finland sought entry in Eureka, Dumas said if there were any political reservations, then they were not expressed.

CSO: 5200/2728

SPACE ARMS

NORWEGIAN GOVERNMENT URGED TO KEEP OPTIONS OPEN ON SDI

Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 23 Jul 85 p 2

[Editorial: "Norway at a Standstill"]

[Text] The controversial American research aimed at a future antimissile defense also has consequences for civilian research. As is known, the government has--forced by existing parliamentary circumstances--asserted that it is not of current interest for Norway to participate in the so-called military part of President Ronald Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). But it is an open question whether it is possible to separate out supposedly civilian research from the military-industrial research complex. It is also doubtful whether the United States is willing to undertake such a limited effort.

On the contrary there is every reason to fear that nearly all research, from testing new materials to computer technology, will be monopolized within SDI or the European alternative Eureka. Nobody knows today what Eureka will develop into. But to the extent that it is possible to see any "civilian alternative" to SDI it is tied to the French Eureka project.

The report from the so-called Klippenberg committee clearly shows that Norwegian industry can promptly suffer significant problems by remaining outside of SDI. Each of us could prefer that it could be possible to stop research on both space-based antimissile systems and other weapon systems. We are also afraid of the prospects of militarizing space, but we are even more afraid that many people appear to believe that it is possible to resign from the world.

It serves no purpose to say that research which has military objectives does not have civilian consequences. It is just as clear that civilian research has military implications and possibilities of application. Norway already has large problems with further development of the necessary technological basis for its industrial future. The great technological initiatives now being taken in other industrial countries and across national borders will reinforce these problems.



The committee with director Erik Klippenberg as chairman points out at the same time that SDI will be able to give new possibilities for renewal of our technological basis, possibilities which today we cannot obtain by other means. The problem is reinforced by Norway remaining outside SDI in a situation whereby we are also outside of European cooperation.

SDI will, regardless of where the research leads in terms of weapons, strengthen the industrial capacity and possibilities of the United States and the participating countries. As a reliable ally in NATO Norway has a certain latitude with the United States and our European allies. But it is of the greatest importance that the government do its utmost to keep all of its options open.

9287

CSO: 5200/2726

SPACE ARMS

AUSTRALIA DEFENSE CHIEF SEES LITTLE GAIN FROM SDI RESEARCH

BK291252 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 1230 GMT 29 Jul 85

[Text] The chief of the Armed Forces, General Sir Philip Bennett, says Australia would gain little from participating in the American space defense program. General Bennett said in Perth he believed the high technology involved in the Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] research in the United States would have limited or no application to Australia's requirements for independence defense.

However, he said high technology in other forms would become a valuable asset to Australia's defense capacity. General Bennett thought that high technology was going to be a solution to Australia's defense problems resulting from the country's small population relative to its Asian neighbors. He said Australia's defense lay in advanced weapons systems, aircraft, and air and ground mobility.

CSO: 5200/4347

SPACE ARMS

JPRS-TAC-85-026  
27 August 1985

# NAKASONE, MITTERRAND DISAGREE ON 'STAR WARS' PROGRAM

OW140502 Tokyo KYODO in English 0445 GMT 14 Jul 85

[Text] Paris, 14 Jul (KYODO)--Japanese Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone and French President Francois Mitterrand disagreed Saturday on assessing U.S. President Ronald Reagan's "star wars" program, Japanese officials said. Nakasone, who has offered "understanding" or broad support for the research program told Mitterrand that Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative had helped draw the Soviet Union into disarmament talks. The Japanese leader, who arrived in Paris earlier in the day on a 10-day European trip, urged Mitterrand to recognize the political effects of the antimissile defense program, the officials said.

The Socialist French President, however, did not change his negative stance, saying France is not in favor of the "star wars" program. The officials quoted Mitterrand as saying that France recognizes no other security measures but nuclear deterrence. The officials quoted Mitterrand as describing (?stars wars) as belonging to the 21st century, the officials said.

Nakasone had a 90-minute meeting with Mitterrand at the Elysee Palace and then continued discussions over lunch for another 90 minutes. The two leaders talked about East-West relations and agreed on the likelihood that new Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev will promote active diplomacy. Mitterrand pointed out that Gorbachev has picked France as the destination of his first foreign trip as Soviet leader. This means Gorbachev is putting emphasis on the West, particularly France, with which Moscow has had ties for over four centuries, Mitterrand said.

Nakasone, who met Gorbachev at the March funeral of his predecessor Konstantin Chernenko, told Mitterrand that Gorbachev is not, in his view, simply a Marxist-Leninist but a modern communist determined to make communism more efficient. Mitterrand promised Nakasone that he will attend the Tokyo summit of seven advanced Western countries in 1986, Japanese officials said. The French president had earlier threatened not to attend the Tokyo summit because the annual event has become too political. Nakasone asked him to support a new round of multilateral trade talks which Japan and the United States have promoted. Mitterrand replied that France is, in principle, in favor of the new trade round.

France is anxious that U.S. farm products may flood the European market as a result of the new trade round, Mitterrand said. France will not oppose the new round if it takes up industrial products and services as well as farm products and if developing countries take part. Nakasone noted the importance of closer relationships between Japan, Europe and the United States, Japanese officials said. He said mutual understanding between Japan and Europe was one means of strengthening world security, the officials said. Mitterrand showed understanding of Nakasone's arguments, they said.

Before having the meeting with the president, Nakasone met with Prime Minister Laurent Fabius. Nakasone and Fabius agreed to conduct joint Japanese-French research into cancer and also to promote cultural ties between the two countries. Nakasone, who left Tokyo Friday, will visit Italy, the Vatican and Belgium after a four-day stay in France. He will return home on 21 July.

CSO: 5260/9

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

SOVIET ARMY PAPER ON HISTORY OF U.S. CHEMICAL ARMS POLICY

Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Jun 85 p 3

[Article by P. Filippov: "Prohibit Once and For All"]

[Text] This took place 22 April 1915 on the Western Front in the area of the Ypres River. A yellowish green cloud descended upon the trenches of the French forces, where there were 17 African companies and 2 battalions of the 45th Artillery Division. The people were suffocating and dying. A general panic broke out. The cloud reached the soldiers and officers who had thrown away their weapons and run to the rear. More than 5,000 people died and about 10,000 were severely injured.

That day can be called one of the darkest dates in the history of mankind. It was precisely then that the kaiser's Germany introduced chemical weapons into action for the first time. During World War I, more than 1 million people were injured by war gases. About 100,000 died....

Barbaric chemical attacks became one of the dreadful symbols of imperialist carnage. And the indignation of all peoples was so great that the prohibition of chemical weapons became a reality. Exactly 60 years ago, on 17 June 1925 in Geneva, a protocol was signed prohibiting the use of suffocating, poisonous and other similar gases and bacteriological substances. This document was soon signed and ratified by the Soviet Union.

The Geneva Protocol strengthened the prohibition of the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons as the generally recognized norm of international law. It played and continues to play an important role in the system of international relations.

From the very beginning, militaristic circles in the United States had a sharply negative attitude toward the prohibition of the use of chemical weapons. The American Congress refused to ratify the Geneva Protocol. And this was by no means accidental. Even then, Washington saw in war gases that superweapon that will permit the United States to achieve world hegemony. For even in 1918, the chemical plants of Edgewood Arsenal were capable of producing 10 times as much mustard gas and phosgene in a year as England and

France taken together. "The general use of chemical weapons on the sea, on the land, and in the air," idly proclaimed Gen A. Freis, first head of the chemical service of the American Army, "will lead to the situation where the country that is able to produce and utilize war gases in large quantities will ensure its own superiority over any other states in a war."

Over the course of 50 years, the official attitude of the United States toward the Geneva Protocol was determined by a concept that was clearly formulated in the 1956 military manual of the U.S. Army: "The United States will not participate in any treaty now in effect that prohibits the use in war of toxic or nontoxic gases." It goes on to say that "the country is not bound by the Geneva Protocol on the prohibition of suffocating, poisonous or other gases and bacteriological means of warfare."

There was a particular increase in the savage appetites of Pentagon strategists after World War II, when German and Japanese specialists in the area of chemical and bacteriological weapons fell into their hands. Instead of trying them as war criminals, they granted them every opportunity to continue their research.

Immediately after the war, using the technology developed in the "Third Reich," the United States began the stepped-up construction of chemical plants for the preparation of the paralytic nerve gas sarin and the equipping of ammunition with it. And specialists from the cartel "I.G. Farbenindustrie" as well as from the military chemical research and experimental centers of the fascist army were attracted to the planning and start-up of plants for the production of sarin. Others were brought into the testing of ammunition with this gas at Edgewood Arsenal as well as at Dugway Proving Grounds. At Fort Detrick, German specialists cooperated with their "colleagues" from Japan who at one time had been on the staff of the bacteriological detachments. A large group of German chemists, having received nerve gases for the first time, synthesized a new gas--VX.

Proving grounds for the testing of new types of barbaric weapons were initially Korea and later the countries of Indochina. The chemical war of American imperialism against the peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea lasted 10 years. In the course of that war, the interventionists used more than 7,000 tons of the war gas CS and about 90,000 tons of special military compounds to destroy vegetation. Dreadful harm was done to the health of the people and to nature in the area.

But the cruelty of the American adherents of "chemical death" evoked unprecedented indignation both in the world as a whole as well as in the United States itself. It was precisely this anger of the peoples that forced Washington to sign the Geneva Protocol in 1975, a half century after it went into effect. The United

States was then forced to ratify the convention on the complete prohibition of bacteriological and toxic weapons.

However, the United States and its NATO allies succeeded in blocking the working out of an international agreement on the prohibition of the production and stockpiling of chemical weapons. During the on-going talks in subsequent years in the Disarmament Committee and the bilateral Soviet-American negotiations, Washington not only did not strive for an agreement but, on the contrary, it resorted to all manner of tricks so as not to allow the adoption of new agreements. The United States even tried to undermine confidence in the 1925 Geneva Protocol and in the 1972 convention on the prohibition of bacteriological weapons. This was done because American imperialism has by no means given up its plans in connection with war gases.

At the present time, the White House is pushing through Congress a program for so-called "chemical rearmament." The goal of this program is the drastic increase in the chemical arsenal of the United States, which today is already the largest in the world. And, as is known, its basis is to be the making operational of a new generation of chemical weapons--binary ammunition. This weapon is intended for deployment in Western Europe and in Asia--near the borders of the USSR and other socialist countries.

Whereas previously the United States did not consider it necessary to hide its intentions and openly declared its unwillingness to join international agreements on chemical and bacteriological weapons, it is now resorting to hypocrisy. While loudly declaring its "striving for the complete prohibition" of chemical weapons, Washington is doing everything possible to obstruct negotiations on this question. In leaving itself various loopholes for continuing the production of war gases, the United States is simultaneously presenting obviously unacceptable conditions for the control of the chemical industry of socialist countries.

In this connection, it is appropriate to recall that in the early 1920's the opponents of the Geneva Protocol had in mind the same sort of unreal procedures for international control, sanctions and counteractions. Prudence triumphed at that time. And now, 60 years later, the interests of mankind even more urgently require that one take the next step, that of prohibiting chemical weapons once and for all and of completing destroying their stockpiles.

9746  
CSO: 5200/1277

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

NEW ZEALAND ANTINUCLEAR LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED THIS YEAR

U.S. To Be Informed

HK250247 Wellington THE EVENING POST in English 19 Jul 85 p 4

[Text] The Government will introduce anti-nuclear legislation before the end of the year, the Prime Minister, Mr David Lange, said yesterday.

But the passage of the legislation would be taken at a measured pace, he said.

He told a post caucus press conference that rushed legislation on the controversial issue, like a "one-off, king-hit without consultation and disclosure," might be seen as a calculated snub to the United States.

And he said that the legislation could be delayed if some matter arose which involved the critical interest of the country and timing was imperative. "Then only a lunatic would press on according to some agenda which the country's interests ought to supersede," he said.

To rush the anti-nuclear legislation could help people who wanted to undermine the relationship between New Zealand and the United States.

If New Zealand suddenly introduced the legislation, it would be seen as a form of rude gesture. He said the United States would be supplied with a copy of the proposed legislation.



27 August 1985

## Official Reaffirms Plan

BK011123 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 1100 GMT 1 Aug 85

[Text] New Zealand's deputy prime minister, Mr Palmer, has reaffirmed that his government plans to introduce legislation banning visits by nuclear ships, but he repeated that it was necessary to have discussions with American officials before such legislation was introduced. Mr Palmer was replying to a senior United States Government official who said America will consider ending its military alliance with New Zealand if it goes ahead with legislation to ban nuclear visits.

The under secretary of state for political affairs, Mr Michael Armacost, told reporters in Washington that plans by New Zealand to introduce legislation means the United States will look again at whether there is any basis for retaining the ANZUS Treaty.

Relations between New Zealand and the United States have been strained since February when the New Zealand Government refused to allow an American warship to make a port call because the ship might be nuclear-powered or nuclear-armed. United States, which is jointed with New Zealand and Australia in the ANZUS military alliance, refuses to say whether any of its ships are carrying nuclear weapons.

CSO: 5200/4348

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

NEW ZEALAND STATEMENT ON ANZUS POSITION

HK010237 Hong Kong HONG KONG STANDARD in English 1 Aug 85 p 1

[Article by Paul Campbell]

[Text] New Zealand has mounted an international campaign to counter criticism of its anti-nuclear policy, in relation to its membership of the ANZUS alliance.

The alliance links the United States, Australia and New Zealand in a common defense policy.

However, a decision by New Zealand to ban nuclear warships from its waters has put a severe strain on the tripartite pact.

In the Australian capital, Canberra, this month the U.S. Secretary of State, Mr George Shultz, accused New Zealand of "walking off the job" and indulging in "escapism and isolationism."

The Australian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr Bill Hayden, said New Zealand had "walked away from ANZUS."

The New Zealand Department of Foreign Affairs has responded with a statement on its role in ANZUS, for distribution to government officials, community and business leaders and the media around the world.

In Hong Kong the New Zealand Commissioner, Mr Frank Muller, said the statement was "a New Zealand perspective on ANZUS."

The statement says that notwithstanding the ships dispute, the alliance remains intact and all three partners have affirmed this.

It continues: "Trilateral defence cooperation has been suspended by the United States but the alliance framework and the core obligations -- to consult and act to meet a common danger in accordance with constitutional processes -- remain intact."

"The annual ANZUS Council session for 1985 was cancelled but not by New Zealand or with New Zealand's concurrence."

Commenting on the statements made by Mr Shultz, it continues:

"New Zealand has consciously and consistently reacted with moderation and restraint to the more extreme United States statements...which portray New Zealand, in some way, as reneging on its ANZUS alliance obligations."

"New Zealand, as a responsible member of the Western community, will continue to exercise this restraint despite the temptation to take issue publicly with the United States."

The statement concludes with three main points:

- ANZUS still exists as a tripartite alliance and New Zealand remains firmly committed to it.
- New Zealand is working hard to resolve its ships visits dispute with the United States.
- There has been no fundamental change in New Zealand's foreign and defence policy.

Mr Muller told THE STANDARD yesterday that New Zealand's Deputy Prime Minister, Mr Geoffrey Palmer, would shortly visit Washington for specific talks on the nuclear ships issue.

In addition the Prime Minister, Mr David Lange, will travel to the United States later this year when further talks will also include the ANZUS row.

He added that legislation is also due to be introduced into the New Zealand parliament to write into law the ban on nuclear weapons and ships in New Zealand waters.

The ANZUS row will also be aired in Rarotonga in the Cook Islands this weekend when the South Pacific Forum gets underway.

The forum groups most Pacific nations and New Zealand and Australia.

A draft treaty has been prepared for the meeting to have the entire South Pacific region declared a nuclear-free zone.

CSO: 5200/4348

NUCLEAR TESTING

SOVIET PRESS ASSAILS U.S. RESPONSE TO MORATORIUM OFFER

Test of U.S. Sincerity

LD301610 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 30 Jul 85

[Text] The Soviet Communist Party leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, has announced that this country is unilaterally stopping all nuclear explosions as of 6 August. Our commentary is by Yuriy Solton.

The Soviet Union hopes by doing this to clear the way for an international treaty outlawing all nuclear tests everywhere. This country put the draft of such a treaty before the United Nations some 10 years ago, at about the same time that it signed agreements with the United States for the limitation of underground nuclear tests and concerning underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. But to this day, there is no treaty and the United States has refused to continue talks on the subject with the Soviet Union and Britain and has not yet ratified the agreements.

As a result, nuclear tests go on, helping to modernize nuclear weapons and make them still more deadly and speeding up the nuclear arms race. The Soviet Union has on more than one occasion urged the nations possessing nuclear weapons to agree with them on a moratorium on all nuclear explosions. Now it has unilaterally set an example and it calls on the United States to do the same.

The Soviet moratorium will begin on 6 August, the day 40 years ago, when the United States first tested an atom bomb on human beings by dropping one on Hiroshima. Four years ago the U.S. president chose 6 August to announce full-scale production of a new kind of nuclear weapon -- the neutron bomb. The way Washington responds to the Soviet Union's unilateral termination of all nuclear explosions will show where the position of America's leaders has changed and whether they are sincere when they say they wish to stop the nuclear arms race.

Their first reaction, however, cannot be seen as positive. Secretary of State, George Shultz has been quick to cast doubts on the advisability of a moratorium, claiming it would be difficult to control. But the United States has time to give thought to the matter, the Soviet moratorium will continue until 1 January next year and it will go on operating if the United States refrains from nuclear explosions. Ever since nuclear weapons first made their appearance in the world, the Soviet Union has worked energetically and consistently to stop their build up, curb military rivalry and promote trust and peaceful cooperation between nations. No nuclear threat would face humanity today if the United States had agreed back in 1946 to the Soviet proposal put before the United Nations for a total ban on nuclear weapons.

27 August 1985

There is still time to stop the nuclear arms race and avert it until all nuclear weapons are scrapped. The Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions is a practical move in this direction. If the United States and other nuclear powers follow the Soviet example and all nuclear tests come to an end, it will mean a great deal for stability and peace in the world.

### U.S. 'Responsible Attitude' Needed

LD301958 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 30 Jul 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; talk by PRAVDA international news analyst Tomas Kolesnichenko]

[Text] Hello, comrades. The new peace initiative proposed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, as the international reactions show, is receiving the widest possible world-wide recognition. This is understandable. The Soviet Union has taken yet another specific step aimed at eliminating the nuclear threat. As is known, there exists a treaty banning nuclear tests in three environments; the atmosphere, in space, and underwater. This accord plays an important role both in limiting the arms race and in preserving the environment. And now the Soviet Union is proposing that underground tests also be banned and has announced its own unilateral moratorium.

What does stopping all tests of nuclear weapons mean? If there are to be no tests at all, there will be no modernization and no perfecting of new kinds of weapons of mass destruction. This in turn means that finally a real bar will be put up against the dangerous nuclear arms race, which carries with it a threat of world catastrophe and puts a heavy burden on all mankind by requiring immense material expenditure. Our new peace initiative clearly fits in with the integrated program of measures the Soviet Union has recently proposed. Overall, it serves the expectations and hopes of all peoples.

And the United States? Is Washington ready to support the Soviet Union's good example and stop the dangerous competition of building up nuclear weapons? Our moratorium comes into effect starting 6 August, the date which is marked worldwide as the day of the Hiroshima tragedy, and has been announced to last up to 1 January of next year. However, if the United States for its part will refrain from holding nuclear tests, the moratorium will continue to operate. Thus, the question of whether nuclear detonations will continue, whether the arms race will continue or if finally, as they say, the nuclear genie will be chased back into its bottle, now depends precisely on the United States actions. This is an opportunity not to be missed. It is a fundamental issue, which to a great extent, the future of all world civilization depends.

Yet the first reaction in the United States is to set off discussion of the Soviet initiative in a false direction. U.S. Secretary of State Shultz and other high-ranking officials of the U.S. Administration hastened to proclaim the Soviet proposal little more than propaganda. And the U.S. side, as has repeatedly happened, is raising the issue of verification, saying that nuclear testing can only be verified on site, and they are even inviting Soviet representatives to the nuclear testing ground in Nevada to observe American testing. But this, of course, is a ruse. It is generally known that any nuclear testing, at the present level of technology, can be easily verified by national means, both in our country and in America. Thus, the American invitation to visit Nevada has the aim, not of banning, but of continuing nuclear testing.

So why, one asks, does Washington not want to renounce all testing of nuclear weapons? The response to that question lies in the fairly earnest admission of American scientists themselves: Underground testing, they say, make it possible to develop systems of new weapons to be moved into space; in the course of testing nuclear weapons are also modernized; and in general, they stress, their nuclear weapons must be convenient to handle, reliable and effective, and for this testing is needed. But this is no argument. The current world situation requires a responsible attitude towards the elimination of the nuclear race, and we wait and hope that in the end Washington will understand this.

#### Wants Continued Testing

LD312211 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 31 Jul 85

[Aleksandr Zholkver Commentary]

[Text] There has been a torrent -- in the full sense of the word -- of response, caused by the Soviet Union's decision to unilaterally halt any kind of nuclear explosions. Schaffer, chairman of the British Committee for the Defense of Peace, has called this decision a historic one.

Indeed, many prominent politicians and scientists are pointing out that a truly unique opportunity [Vozmozhnost] for the full and universal halt to atomic weapon testing is now opening up, and thereby to curb the most dangerous and very costly nuclear arms race. You see, if the United States followed the USSR's example and curbed its nuclear explosions, then our moratorium would also continue to operate after 1 January next year. And there are no doubts that a USSR-United States moratorium would also serve as a good example to other states which have atomic weapons at their disposal.

It is noteworthy that this is the very assessment that is being made of the situation that has now arisen in Japan, in a country that has experienced the horrors of atomic bombings on its territory. The mayor of Hiroshima who four decades ago became a victim of the first American atom bomb stated that the USSR's step inspires hopes for a halt to nuclear weapon testing by all countries and the subsequent liquidation of this means of mass destruction.

And so it is up to Washington. However, its first reaction is causing amazement, at the least. Hardly had the teletypes conveying Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's announcement lapsed into silence, than a representative of the Washington administration, not even having taken the trouble to seriously analyze a most important Soviet proposal, tried to reject and discredit it right there and then. He asserted that, supposedly, it is impossible to monitor a moratorium on nuclear explosions but specialists, including American ones, speak differently.

A leader of the American Center for Defense Information, retired Admiral Carroll, states bluntly that with the present level of technology for the discovery of nuclear explosions and even for determining their power by national means, there is no difficulty whatsoever. No the matter here clearly does not lie in technology but in politics.

The same Washington admits candidly that it would not like to pursue a halt to nuclear explosions because this, you see, is not in the interests of the United States.

THE NEW YORK TIMES writes bluntly that the United States is interested in the continuation of nuclear tests both with the aim of developing weapons for star wars and for, I quote, searching for ways to wage a prolonged nuclear war. But this is a dangerous, I will say bluntly, a suicidal policy.

We will hope that in Washington too, political realism and a feeling of responsibility will gain the upper hand, and that the United States will respond positively to a most important peace initiative by our country, which would meet the aspirations and hopes of all peoples.

#### FRG Politician Cited

LD301519 Moscow TASS in English 1355 GMT 30 Jul 85

[Text] Bonn, 30 Jul (TASS)--Hermann Scheer, a prominent expert of the SPD parliamentary group for disarmament issues, has evaluated the unconstructive stand of the U.S. Administration on the Soviet decision to terminate unilaterally all nuclear blasts as a manifestation of narrow-mindedness and die-hard attitude. It is inadmissible, he said in Bonn today, to reject the Soviet Union's new proposal, appraising it only as a "propaganda ploy."

The U.S. Administration, Hermann Scheer said, is missing every chance to conclude a treaty banning nuclear weapons tests, as in real fact, it has absolutely no stake in putting an end to these tests. Washington's proposition that a suspension of nuclear weapons tests is allegedly not verifiable does not hold water, the Soviet Democratic expert pointed out. Present-day seismological instruments make it possible to exercise proper control.

#### U.S. Observers 'Dissatisfied'

LD311500 Moscow TASS in English 1319 GMT 31 Jul 85

["Apropos of One Briefing"--TASS headline]

[Text] Washington, July 31 TASS -- Reporting in detail the text of the statement made by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, M.S. Gorbachev, about the Soviet Union's decision to stop unilaterally any nuclear explosions, American mass media bring into the fore the words of the Soviet leader to the effect that the USSR expects the United States to respond positively to that initiative and stop its nuclear explosions. The press and television underline that, although the Soviet Union introduced the unilateral moratorium till January 1, 1986, it will remain in effect as long as the United States, on its part, refrains from conducting nuclear tests.

American observers note that a moratorium by both countries would be a good example for other states possessing nuclear weapons. On the whole, the press notes that the new major decision of the Soviet leadership confirms yet another time the dynamism of the foreign policy of the USSR, and Moscow's initiative in actions aimed at terminating the nuclear arms race. In taking note of that, many mass media ask the question: Why

doesn't the United States agree to the Soviet proposal? A high-ranking administration official tried to provide an answer at a special briefing where he made an unconvincing statement to the effect that the Soviet initiative was aimed at freezing "Soviet superiority". Answering the question concerning the U.S. response to the Soviet proposal on joining the moratorium, the administration spokesman said that the testing would go on.

Local observers regard his statement to be the public reaction of the White House to the Soviet proposal.

The briefing of the high ranking administration official convincingly demonstrated that the American proposal to invite Soviet observers to underground nuclear tests in Nevada state was made in essence with the aim of distracting attention from the proposal put forward by the Soviet Union. Asked by newsmen why that "initiative" of the Washington administration precisely coincided in time with the USSR's proposal on a moratorium, the official actually had to admit that by taking that move the United States wanted to forestall the Soviet statement. Trying to wriggle out of the difficult situation where he had been led by newsmen's questions the person conducting the briefing cynically tried to picture it as a mere coincidence and nothing more.

But the fact that the U.S. Administration, informed beforehand about that major move of the Soviet Union's, decided to react to it that way in a bid to neutralize its impact on American and world public opinion, speaks for itself.

Newsmen remained clearly unsatisfied with the explanations provided by the administration official and asked him why instead of saying a flat "no" to the Soviet Union the United States should not propose, on its part, to accompany a mutual moratorium with control and on-site verification which are advocated by the White House. The person conducting the briefing found nothing better than to say that U.S. consent to a moratorium would mean the cessation of nuclear testing -- and that was something the United States was not ready for at present.

American reaction to the Soviet initiative demonstrates two important points. First, despite the White House's hasty efforts to counter it with its own "initiative" on inviting Soviet observers to the testing of U.S. nuclear weapons, they are incompatible in significance.

It should be noted that, as the White House official spokesman, L. Speakes, explained, the U.S. proposal means a single invitation, and at the same time the U.S. side reserves the right to decide and has not decided yet at which test exactly Soviet observers could be present. Secondly, the Soviet and American proposals are not compatible in essence, since the realization of the American one would in effect mean the recognition of the legitimacy of the conduct of nuclear weapon tests by the United States in the future as well -- and that is precisely what the Soviet proposal is directed against. This is the substance of the new American propaganda "initiative".

Despite attempts to neutralize the appraisal by the public of the Soviet proposal to stop unilaterally any nuclear explosions, it remains in the focus of attention of political and public quarters in the United States. And they wait for the U.S. administration to provide an answer in substance, and not to engage in a word-juggling act.



### Verification Concerns 'Hypocritical'

LD311722 Moscow TASS in English 1659 GMT 31 Jul 85

[Text] Moscow, July 31 TASS -- BY TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev.

Without bothering itself about studying in earnest the initiative of the Soviet Union which decided to stop unilaterally any nuclear explosions as of August 6, Washington has hastily announced that the United States will not follow the Soviet example.

Instead, the U.S. administration actually suggested that nuclear weapon tests be legalized for an indefinite period since, allegedly, much remains to be done in verifying compliance with arms control accords.

The least that can be said about the U.S. administration's pronouncements about its "concern" over the problems of verifying the observance of a moratorium on nuclear blasts is that they smack of hypocrisy.

It is the United States which unilaterally foiled late in 1980 the agreed-upon accord between the USSR, the United States and Britain on a comprehensive ban on nuclear weapon tests. Leading U.S. experts admit that the tripartite agreement envisaged, specifically, several additional effective verification measures.

The Soviet Union's decision to establish a moratorium on nuclear blasts simplifies the verification problem since the point at issue is the termination of both testing of nuclear weapons and nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. There is thus no need for verification procedures according to different designations of the blasts.

It must be mentioned that Washington is now undertaking attempts to belittle the significance of any accord on a comprehensive ban on nuclear explosions. As is known, having signed the 1963 Limited Test Ban Treaty, the United States pledged to strive for the prohibition of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for ever.

At present, explains White House Deputy Press Secretary Larry Speakes, the United States is prepared to consider only limiting nuclear weapon tests, which plays, according to him, a modest role. One is puzzled in this connection by another statement by Speakes who asserted that the U.S. attitude towards a comprehensive nuclear weapon test ban treaty remains unchanged.

According to the NEW YORK TIMES newspaper, which quotes administration officials, the continuation of underground nuclear explosions is of great importance for the United States in two key areas of current research -- for developing a laser, intended for use in "star wars," and for finding ways to wage a protracted nuclear war.

Washington's "concern" over moratorium observance verification is a strategem designed to divert world public attention from the U.S. intentions to build up nuclear armaments, with nuclear weapon testing being an integral part of this policy

27 August 1985

## U.S. Wants Continued Testing

LD011711 Moscow World Service in English 2300 GMT 31 Jul 85

[From the "Roundup of Political Events" program]

[Text] Caught off balance by the Soviet announcement about a unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing from 6 August until next 1 January, United States officials have gone on the defensive and many of them have lost their cool:

The arguments against the moratorium vary from sticking labels such as propaganda, to citing all kinds of technical problems, one of them verification. Now what is there to verify if there are not going to be any nuclear blasts in the Soviet Union for 5 months. With no blasts at all, nobody will have to measure any yields and scientists have the means, like sensitive earth centers, not only to tell a nuclear blast from an earthquake but also a military explosion from a peaceful one, conducted to say divert the course of a river.

Military experts in Sweden can do all this. They compile annual statistics on nuclear explosions and their nature. If that can be done in Sweden and other countries, the same can be done and in fact is done by American experts. So much for the so-called verification problem.

The latest American idea concerning nuclear testing is to exchange teams of experts who would monitor nuclear explosions in the United States and the Soviet Union. The same information can be gathered and has been gathered by such national means of control as satellites, earth centers and others. The American proposal seeks to perpetuate nuclear testing and hence the arms race under the supervision of experts. Call them experts, call them onlookers or eye witness, what can they change? Will they stop the nuclear arms race? No, it will continue as before.

When the United States developed the earth-hugging and nuclear-tipped long range cruise missile, its experts made the missile's nuclear warhead virtually unrecognizable from a conventional one. In other words it is very difficult to tell a nuclear-tipped cruise missile from a conventional one. Where were all those champions of control and verification who yelled murder and shed bitter tears over the ostensible verification problems in connection with the Soviet moratorium? The White House plans to build thousands of such missiles, so what do we do, exchange 10,000 experts to check on what is inside each of them?

There must be a more serious reason for the administration's not wanting to introduce a similar moratorium and set a good example to other nuclear powers than verification. Continued underground testing of nuclear weapons is vital for several areas of the current American research into space weapons. Such tests are needed to develop an X-ray laser using a low-yield nuclear explosion as a source of energy. Nuclear tests are also important if a nation is looking for ways to fight a long nuclear war. Fighting a protracted nuclear war is one of the priorities listed in two Pentagon documents, Fiscal Defense Guidance for 1984-88 and 1985-89.

LD030125 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 2 Aug 85

[Commentary by political observer Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] The major new foreign policy initiative put forward to CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement providing for the USSR's unilateral cessation of all nuclear explosions beginning 6 August is evoking a great response and support throughout the world. Here is our political observer, Aleksandr Zholkver:

One important line can be seen quite clearly in the foreign reaction to the Soviet Union's decision to end nuclear explosions: a recognition of the consistent nature of our country's efforts to prevent nuclear war. One cannot but note that the new USSR initiative set out in Mikhail's Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement undoubtedly is important, but it is far from the only one.

I recall that our country, again unilaterally, pledged 3 years ago not to use nuclear weapons first. The Soviet moratorium on placing antisatellite weapons into space has been in force for 2 years and the Soviet Union, on its own initiative, this April halted the deployment of its medium-range missiles in Europe. As far as the problem of ending nuclear weapon tests is concerned, here the list of our country's initiatives is even longer. The Soviet Union in 1955 appealed to all nuclear powers to end such tests, and in 1963 at our country's initiative, a treaty was signed to ban tests in the atmosphere, in space, and underwater. The Soviet Union came out then in favor of banning underground tests as well. However, the United States, Britain, and France did not agree with this. The USSR then suggested that the magnitude of underground tests should at least be limited and that even peaceful nuclear explosions should be regulated. The corresponding treaties were signed, but not ratified by the United States.

And what is Washington's stance on this question now? A lot of noise is now being made there of the fact that the United States is inviting Soviet representatives to spend some time at a U.S. nuclear weapon test. But for what reason? To legitimize the nuclear explosion by their presence? Incidentally, there is absolutely no need to be present at a nuclear testing ground to establish that an explosion has actually taken place, or even to determine its magnitude. Today's national technical facilities enable nuclear explosions to be monitored with a high degree of precision. But it is not a matter of continuing them, but of ending them, because that is the only way to break the vicious circle of the arms race.

No official reply has thus far been received from Washington to the Soviet proposal. One would like to hope that the U.S. Government has not yet said its final word in reply to our country's new manifestation of goodwill.

27 August 1985

## Total Ban Needed

PM021341 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Aug 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Vikentiy Matveyev "Political Observer's Opinion": "Yet Another Good Example"]

[Text] The attitude toward a complete nuclear test ban is a characteristic indicator of whether the government of a particular nuclear power intends to seek the curtailment and elimination of these armaments which pose an unprecedented threat to the whole of mankind. No weapon has ever been introduced into arsenals without being tested beforehand. That is why the nuclear arms race pioneers in the United States were bitterly opposed to an accord with the Soviet Union at the end of the fifties and beginning of the sixties on banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in space, and underwater. The talks on this question lasted more than 5 years and ended successfully in August 1963 in an atmosphere of mounting world public alarm in connection with the destructive consequences of nuclear explosions in terms of people's health.

Opponents of the ban in the United States used all manner of scare tactics against the public in an effort to wreck congressional ratification of the treaty signed by the USSR, the United States, and Britain. They talked about the "undermining of U.S. security," the "impossibility of monitoring observance of the treaty," and so on and so forth. More than 2 decades of successful operation of the 1963 treaty convincingly refute these "arguments."

But the selfsame references have been made in recent years by U.S. officials in response to demands, actively supported, incidentally, by UN decisions, for an all-embracing ban on nuclear weapon tests and its extension to underground explosions.

As long as there is no such ban, tests of new mass destruction weapon systems will stimulate the arms race, make the process of control increasingly complicated, and place new barriers in the way of disarmament talks.

The Reagan administration decided in mid-1983 to break off the talks on an all-embracing nuclear test ban in connection with the implementation of an extensive program for the buildup and improvement of nuclear armaments, envisaging the production of 17,000 new nuclear warheads for the nineties to replace the 11,000 "obsolete" units which are expected to be withdrawn. As a result, the U.S. nuclear arsenal will increase by 6,000 nuclear units and total U.S. stocks of nuclear weapons will reach 32,000 units.

Consequently, the question of nuclear tests is not of independent significance, but serves as the key to success in preventing an even more dangerous and ruinous race involving the most destructive armaments.

It would be no exaggeration to say that the demand for a complete and universal ban on nuclear tests is now being made by the broadest strata of political, religious, scientific, and public circles in various countries. These demands can also be heard in the U.S. Congress. In June 1983, for example, over 100 members of the House of Representatives submitted a draft resolution urging the government to immediately resume talks on a complete and general nuclear test ban. A similar resolution was presented by 37 members of the Senate.

The names of public organizations in the United States alone which advocate a complete nuclear test ban would cover several pages. The major churches in the United States, Britain, the FRG, and other countries are appealing for a ban to be sought.

In its desire to help end dangerous competition in the buildup of nuclear arsenals and its wish to set a good example, the Soviet Union has decided to unilaterally halt all nuclear explosions as of 6 August this year. The statement by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev contains an appeal to the U.S. Government to halt its own nuclear explosions on the same date, which is being observed all over the world as the day of the Hiroshima tragedy. The Soviet moratorium extends until 1 January 1986. But it will continue to operate if the United States, for its part, refrains from carrying out nuclear explosions.

A mutual Soviet-American moratorium on all nuclear explosions would also be a good example to other states which have nuclear weapons.

According to a UPI report, U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz learned of the new peace-loving Soviet initiative as he was flying from the United States to Helsinki. It was on the aircraft that he told the group of U.S. journalists accompanying him that the United States does not intend to suspend its nuclear tests. He repeated previous Washington officials' claims that it would be "impossible to verify" the agreement if it were reached.

On the next day Richard Perle, a senior figure at the Pentagon, was even more abrupt and uncompromising on the matter. One can conclude, therefore, that the voice of the State Department chief on this question is the voice of the Pentagon leaders.

As for the claims about "monitoring" and "verification" problems and so forth, they smack of hypocrisy, concealing Washington leading circles' obsession with more and more destabilizing types of mass destruction weapons. How can one talk of the "impossibility of verification" when the U.S. side is shying away from the very talks which would provide the only possible medium for the practical consideration of this question.

Certainly not for the first time, Washington has suggested that the Soviet Union send a group of experts to attend U.S. nuclear weapon tests. And they are pretending it is some kind of "constructive step"! The world community, in the shape of the vast majority of UN member states, declares that it is fed up to the back teeth with "demonstrations," if that is the word. The task is not to try to give them a semblance of "legitimacy," but to put an end to the nuclear arms race in all its forms and manifestations.

The U.S. atomic weapon used against civilians in Hiroshima and Nagasaki 40 years ago is still claiming victims. People affected by atomic radiation 40 years ago are still dying in Japanese hospitals. What need do we have of a further "demonstration" of the baneful nature of mass destruction weapons!

By declaring a moratorium on all nuclear explosions, the Soviet Union is taking a new unilateral step of great political significance to aid collective efforts in the disarmament sphere. As is known, the moratorium declared by our country on the deployment of medium-range missiles in the European part of the USSR is still effective. Other countermeasures by the USSR in connection with the deployment of the new U.S. missiles in Western Europe have also been suspended.

Washington officials are obviously embarrassed and can do no better than to repeat the line about the "propaganda nature" of these realistic and concrete peace-loving steps by our country. At the same time, Washington was compelled to state anxiously that these steps will influence a broad strata of the world public, including the U.S. public. Inveterate advocates of the arms race fear public pressure which would restrict their freedom of action.

We will see. In effecting its peace-loving initiatives, the Soviet Union is not acting out of considerations of expediency, but is guided by the fundamental interests of the cause of world peace. This positive imprint is also to be found on the USSR's important new initiative which meets the vital interests of all peoples without exception.

#### U.S. 'Counterproposal' Hit

LD031018 Moscow TASS in English 0953 GMT 3 Aug 85

[Text] Moscow, August 3 TASS -- The newspaper PRAVDA carries today a short commentary by Yevgeniy Grigoryev headlined "But They Are Being Evasive." It says:

People all over the world are discussing with much interest the decision of the Soviet Government to end all nuclear blasts unilaterally beginning from August 6 and its call to the United States to follow this example. All who do not turn a blind eye to the facts, and they make a vast majority of people in the world, see that the Soviet Union has offered a real opportunity to go over from a moratorium to a total ban on nuclear weapons test. A moratorium on nuclear blasts, the newspaper WASHINGTON POST aptly remarked on August 1, could slow down the rate of the arms race, since the weapons which cannot be tested will, probably, never be manufactured.

Thus at hand is the opportunity of an important step in the interests of eliminating the nuclear threat. They should have used that opportunity. This is realized by many figures in the United States itself. If Washington followed Moscow's example this would contribute to building up a climate of confidence, improving the atmosphere in Soviet-American relations.

The Soviet Union has displayed most serious intentions. This is seen, in particular, from the fact that it had notified the U.S. Administration in advance about its proposal and voiced hope for a positive response to it.

Yet, they in Washington were in a hurry, so to say, to "forestall" the Soviet initiative. A White House official was quoted by the U.S. press as frankly saying that it was necessary to reject the Soviet proposal outright so that the people should have no hope that such a moratorium could be introduced. A hasty "counter-proposal" followed concerning the invitation that the USSR send its observers to attend an underground nuclear test in Nevada. Yet this proposal is in the nature of a political-distracting propaganda manoeuvre.

That was a carefully calculated move aimed at substituting one issue for another. Outwardly they may seem to belong to one and the same field, but in their essence they are directly opposite: The USSR proposes a moratorium on all nuclear blasts, an end to them, while the USA is for continuing nuclear tests.

A large group of congressmen is known to have addressed an appeal to the U.S. President requesting that the Soviet statement be seriously examined and relevant draft resolutions be tabled in Senate and House of Representatives.

Most of American scientists and public figures approve of the Soviet moratorium in some or another measure, welcome it as an important initiative laying the groundwork for the resolution of the problem.

It can be said that many people overseas admit that a "goal has been scored into the American cage" on the issue of ending nuclear tests and however much Washington may try to win it all back, it will be impossible. Another difficult task is to conceal the real causes of the reluctance of the U.S. Administration to follow the USSR's example.

These causes become obvious time and again at briefings held in Washington. They warn that if the USA agreed to the moratorium, the Pentagon would have to suspend a number of military programmes, or as they are called the "supposed systems." Hence the White House team stubbornly repeats its "invitation" to tests.

As was pointed out at a press conference in Moscow, no official answer to the Soviet proposal has been received so far. Yet it clearly follows from different statements made in Washington that they are not going to embark on the path of practical prohibition of nuclear blasts, and consequently on the path of curbing and then eliminating the nuclear arsenals. Obviously, this is not the aim of U.S. policy.

Yet they overseas could prove the contrary. But this makes it necessary for them to follow the example of the USSR, whose new important initiative is welcomed by the whole peaceable mankind.

#### PRAVDA Review 4 August

PM061623 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Aug 85 First Edition p 4

[Thomas Kolesnichenko "International Review"]

[Excerpt] Two Approaches

In 2 days, on 6 August, the whole world will mark the 40th anniversary of the barbarous atomic bombing of Hiroshima -- a crime committed by the United States against mankind. There was neither justification nor excuse for this. As a result of the use of the atomic bomb at Hiroshima, and then at Nagasaki 3 days later, over 300,000 people died. Even today people on the Japanese islands, affected by radiation sickness decades later, continue to die. The anniversary of the tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki is an urgent reminder of the persistent need to ban and liquidate nuclear weapons totally.

It is profoundly symbolic that just at this time M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has put forward a new and exceptionally important foreign policy initiative aimed at removing the nuclear threat and strengthening peace. Desiring to set a good example, the Soviet Union has resolved to unilaterally halt all nuclear explosions starting 6 August and has appealed to the U.S. Government to halt its nuclear explosions from that date also.

Thus favorable conditions would be created for concluding an international treaty totally banning nuclear weapon tests. As is known, the Moscow Treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the three environments -- in the atmosphere, underwater, and in outer space -- is in existence. This treaty plays a considerable role in limiting the arms race and safeguarding the environment. The new Soviet initiative also envisages halting underground nuclear tests -- that is, taking a fundamental step forward.

What does halting all nuclear weapons tests mean? If there are no tests, there will be no modernization or improvement of new types of mass destruction weapons, which are developed precisely through such tests. This in turn means that ultimately a real barrier may be erected to the senseless nuclear arms race, which bears within it the threat of world catastrophe. Such a prospect meets the aspirations of all peoples.

The numerous international responses attest that the new USSR initiative is receiving the very highest recognition. Prominent politicians and public figures from various countries and the foreign mass media note that the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's statement is part of a comprehensive program of measures put forward recently by the Soviet Union with a view to halting the arms race and securing disarmament. It is completely in line with the Soviet approach to the Geneva talks, is aimed against the creation of all new systems of nuclear weapons, whether in space or on earth, and will ultimately lead to the total banning and elimination of nuclear weapons.

In putting forward its proposal, the Soviet Union expected that the United States would respond positively to this initiative. It must be said that the American public has reacted to it with great interest. However, official Washington's very first reaction makes it clear that people there have not even deigned to analyze the Soviet proposal seriously, but are trying to reject it out of hand.

Moreover, the haste with which Secretary of State G. Shultz and other high-ranking U.S. Administration officials resorted to the well-worn anti-Soviet cliches, declaring the USSR's new initiative to be a piece of "propaganda" aimed at "freezing Soviet superiority," immediately raises the legitimate question: Does the United States have any intention at all of negotiating with the USSR on questions of limiting and reducing nuclear arms?

Well-known television commentator P. Jennings observed: "People in Washington (he means in the U.S. Congress -- T.K.) are actively criticizing President Reagan's decision to reject the Soviet appeal to introduce a moratorium on all nuclear explosions. One administration critic in Congress said that his decision made it clear that he is acting according to the principle: If the USSR proposes, the United States objects. It is impossible to reach agreement in the arms control sphere with such an approach."

Finding itself in an unenviable position, Washington is now trying to set the discussions of the Soviet proposal on a false track. With this aim, the U.S. side has put forward its own "initiative" and, as has already happened on more than one occasion, has dragged out the question of control. They say that nuclear tests can only be monitored on the spot. So, they say, let Soviet experts come with their measuring instruments to the next underground tests of U.S. nuclear weapons in Nevada. But it is known that all nuclear tests can easily be monitored by national means. As in our country, so in America. Anyway, one might ask, what are we talking about -- about halting all tests or about continuing to register and measure the yield of new types of weapons? It is obvious to all that the U.S. invitation to Nevada is aimed not at banning but at continuing tests.

By all accounts, the Washington administration is not only not about to reduce its nuclear arsenals, it even intends to increase them. This concerns space strike weapons particularly. And there is no secret here. THE NEW YORK TIMES asserts that "the continuation of underground nuclear weapons tests is of great importance for the United States in two key spheres: The tests are necessary to develop the laser which is planned for use in the Strategic Defense Initiative, and also to seek ways to wage a protracted nuclear war."



By and large people across the ocean recognize that during tests new nuclear weapon systems are modernized [as published], especially those to be launched into space. Tests are also necessary to ensure that U.S. nuclear means are safe in storage, reliable, and effective. This, if one may say so, is precisely the "argument" that G. Shultz had in mind when he hastened to state that Washington will not establish a moratorium, since "this is not in the U.S. interests."

It would be more accurate to say "not in the interests" of the U.S. military-industrial complex, those reactionary political circles in America which are hatching fantastic plans for military superiority and which are ready for the sake of this to drive the world into an endless arms race. This approach by Washington to the most acute problem of today runs counter to the interests of the United States itself.

Our moratorium has been declared until 1 January next year. However, if the United States for its part refrains from carrying out nuclear tests, it will remain in effect longer. So, much now depends on the United States: whether nuclear explosions will be continued further or not: whether there will continue to be an arms race or whether finally, as they say, the nuclear genie will be successfully chased back into the bottle. Such an opportunity must not be missed. This is a fundamental question and it requires a responsible approach. It could be said that the future of the whole of world civilization depends on it.

#### U.S. Distorts Arguments

LD051506 Moscow TASS in English 1435 GMT 5 Aug 85

["White House Still Silent on Soviet Initiative"--TASS headline]

[Text] Washington, August 5 TASS -- The Soviet Union's decision to unilaterally stop any nuclear explosions remains in the focus of attention of U.S. politicians and public figures.

U.S. law-makers and representatives of the American public recently held a news conference in the capitol, which was specially devoted to the latest Soviet initiative. Speakers there urged the U.S. President to reciprocate the Soviet proposal by imposing an American moratorium and start talks with the USSR on a comprehensive nuclear test ban.

But the White House has not given an official response so far.

The local press says that the Soviet initiative has put the administration in a difficult position which, all indications are, it is still looking a way out of. This is admitted even by news analysts who usually prefer identifying with Washington's official line on arms control. The press notes that a reciprocal moratorium on any nuclear blasts objectively will not do any harm to U.S. national security interests and that there are all necessary conditions for its practical implementation, including those allowing its reliable verification. A number of papers has said bluntly that the ball is now in the U.S. Administration's court, with everything now hinging on whether it is really prepared for an accord with the Soviet Union or it will continue its line of shunning a ban on underground nuclear testing.

Commentators also note that the Pentagon is busy feeding the mass media the argument that accepting the Soviet proposal would mean suspending a number of top-priority military programs contemplated by the American Administration. THE WASHINGTON POST reported, for instance, that the "star wars" program, touted as a non-nuclear one, required nuclear tests of one of its components, namely an X-ray laser.

On the whole, U.S. politicians advocating arms control agree unequivocally that the latest move of the Soviet Union, paving the way towards nuclear arms limitation, has shown graphically who really seeks nuclear disarmament and who rejects it. A press conference in Moscow over the USSR's latest, major foreign-policy initiative has riveted much attention here. The U.S. Administration has taken pains either to hush up or distort the arguments cited there in favor of that initiative. Those influencing U.S. public opinion are in effect trying to fold up the discussion of the issue of a comprehensive nuclear test ban.

#### White House Official Cited

OW060633 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1100 GMT 5 Aug 85

[From "The World Today" program presented by Igor Kudrin]

[Text] Hello Comrades. The new peace initiative of the Soviet Union proposed in the statement of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev comes into effect tomorrow. Our country will unilaterally end all nuclear blasts.

Millions of people in various countries have assessed this initiative as new proof of the USSR's desire to end the arms race. The statement by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary has often been called historic in recent days, in the United States as well. Alas, as television viewers know, official Washington hastened, out of hand as they say, to reject the Soviet initiative, calling it propaganda, unrealistic, and supposedly giving the Soviet Union an advantage.

According to THE WASHINGTON POST, a responsible White House official described frankly the political substance of the administration's decision when he declared that it was essential to reject the Soviet proposal immediately, Comrades, I wish to particularly stress that word immediately, so that there can be no cause for hope among the American people that a moratorium of this sort could ever be introduced. Well, the official expressed himself most clearly. Now here is the testimony of such an authority as Paul Warnke, who conducted arms control talks under President Carter. He said: The current administration does not want to ban nuclear weapons tests; it is not interested in arms control.

27 August 1985

## Reagan News Conference Remarks

LD072200 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 7 Aug 85

[Text] Good day, comrades. The United States now finds itself facing a test in the eyes of public opinion. Indeed, official Washington claims that its goal is the destruction of nuclear weapons. In that case it would be logical to begin by halting the testing of such weapons. The halting of nuclear explosions would make it impossible for a new generation of these weapons, the third generation, as U.S. military figures call it, to appear on earth. What's more, existing weapons will also wither if they are not tested. A year ago antiwar organizations in the United States itself began a campaign for ending nuclear explosions from 6 August 1985, in other words the 40th anniversary of the first use of atomic weapons in war. Naturally these organizations are now applauding our country for announcing an end to tests from this date and they are awaiting a response from their own government.

The President found himself in a difficult position when a journalist at a news conference asked him the following question: Why can't we accept the Soviet leader's proposal and announce a joint moratorium of nuclear tests?

The President answered by saying that in this area we have to catch up with the Russians who deliberately proposed this moratorium to prevent us from catching up with them. That was how the President put it. As is his wont, the President was feigning weakness. This is yet another variation of the argument about lagging behind. But this time it sounds particularly unconvincing. After all, the American side has carried out one third more tests. The U.S. military are entitled to be annoyed at their commander in chief, a position given to the President under the constitution. They are entitled to be annoyed because he is saying that even though they have carried out more tests, they have contrived to fall behind.

Clearly, this is a case of wanting to overtake rather than needing to catch up. Other questions were asked at the news conference. This led to a report to the effect that after the United States completed its tests, it would allegedly be willing to join in the moratorium. News agencies disseminated this news throughout the world, describing it as some sort of change in the U.S. position.

But at the news conference itself the President was asked whether a date had been set for ending the U.S. tests, in a year's time for example. And Reagan twice said: I don't know, I don't know. That was the declaration made by the commander in chief. But one conclusion speaks for itself. The President mentioned the Midgetman missile. They intend to test it until the end of the 1980's. By that time the "star wars" program will be reaching fruition. So, U.S. readiness to go along with a future moratorium is being postponed until the cows come home, as the saying goes.

After the news conference, the White House issued a correction to the pronouncements made by its incumbent, a correction to the effect that no change had taken place in the U.S. position. The journalists had simply gotten the wrong impression.

So, one can draw the following conclusion. The United States has not passed the test of tests. French explosions can be expected. Soon there will have been 900 of them. Not even the colossal political cost of this insane nuclear passion is halting Washington. After all, world public opinion is comparing the Soviet position and the U.S. position. And the comparison shows who the trailblazer in the arms race is. And, on the 40th anniversary of the atomic bombings, public opinion is condemning America, not just for the original bombing of Hiroshima but for the further improvement and refinement of weapons for future Hiroshimas.

### U.S. Stand 'Destructive'

LD062323 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 6 Aug 85

[Nikolay Shishlin commentary]

[Text] In the course of a regular press conference, Ronald Reagan, the President of the United States of America, announced the U.S. rejection of the moratorium on any nuclear explosions introduced by the Soviet Union. Nikolay Shishlin is at the microphone.

It is well known that the United States, not having read carefully the Soviet decision on a moratorium on all nuclear explosions, has declined to join in the Soviet initiative. At first the refusal was made public by White House officials, then it was repeated by U.S. Secretary of State Shultz. At his first press conference following his illness, President Reagan has confirmed this U.S. position. As usual, the President's statement at the press conference came to a glorification of U.S. achievements, and lavish praise of his own policy. But the culminating point of this press conference was nevertheless the reaction to the Soviet initiative; it is, after all, negative, but what is characteristic is that Reagan, in particular, said it is not known when the Americans will complete their tests.

In a word, the U.S. position has been and remains destructive. But this is not all that Reagan's current press conference speaks of. It seems to me that the waves of support for the Soviet initiative are rolling up to the White House and the administration is attempting to dampen them somehow. This, of course, is very important, is very substantial because support for the Soviet initiative is continuing to grow. What I have in mind is the resolute solidarity with the Soviet position of the socialist states and the very broad actions of the international public and influential political circles. Thus, in evaluating the fate of the Soviet initiative, we can say that this initiative is continuing to gather strength. Its influence is increasing and becoming more substantial, and deep.

### Reagan 'Conditions' Criticized

LD061721 Moscow TASS in English 1649 GMT 6 Aug 85

["Washington's Manipulations With Moratorium on Nuclear Explosions"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, August 6 (TASS) -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev.

President Ronald Reagan has "formulated" rather unclearly two conditions for the United States joining the moratorium on nuclear explosions, the conditions, which, by the way, exclude each other, and tried to cast aspersions on the very idea of ending nuclear tests.

At yesterday's press conference in the White House, the President at first almost said that the United States is "willing" to stop nuclear explosions in future, if the Soviet Union "wants to make that a permanent moratorium." Then he advanced the second term on which the USA will join the moratorium -- the completion of the tests of U.S. nuclear weapons. But, according to him, the United States "hasn't even come to that stage yet" and he, Reagan, does not know when that might be. In conclusion, having, apparently, got confused altogether, the President said the decisions should be made "not with moratoriums of that kind."

The muddled up setting out by the President of the U.S. stand on nuclear explosions caused embarrassment among his assistants. After the press conference, spokesman for the White House Edward Djerejian had to make "explanations." He said that Reagan had not advanced any new initiatives and that prior to announcing a moratorium the United States must settle the problems of verification and ensure modernization of the U.S. nuclear weapon systems.

In his contradictory statement, President Reagan, specifically, tried to prove that agreement on a moratorium on nuclear explosions will be possible only after new U.S. strategic arms are developed and tested. But in addition to the "Midgetman" intercontinental ballistic missile, which Reagan mentioned, work is now conducted in the USA to create MX missiles, Trident-II missiles, cruise missiles of all kinds of basing and other mass destruction weapons. The end to these programmes is not in sight. They were started at different time and so will be concluded at different time.

Obviously wishing to smooth over the United States' clearly obstructionist stand on the question of moratorium, Reagan seeks to mislead the world public opinion and promises the U.S. readiness to agree on banning nuclear explosions, as the saying goes, "when two Sundays come together."

#### Army Paper Commentary

PM071030 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Aug 85 Second Edition p 3

["Obstructionist U.S. Stance"]

[Text] U.S. President Ronald Reagan held a press conference at which he upheld a further buildup of the U.S. strategic armaments and the development of space arms under his "star wars" programme.

During the press conference he was asked why should the United States not accept the Soviet Union's proposal and declare a joint moratorium on nuclear tests? R. Reagan made it clear that the United States refused to accept the Soviet proposal. In an attempt to substantiate his stand, he alleged, without any regard for the facts, that the bilateral moratorium would benefit the Soviet Union alone and that the United States had to "complete tests." But when one of the newsmen disagreed saying that the U.S. tests were known to have been completed, Reagan denied it.

When this question was followed by another specifying when the U.S. testing would end, perhaps, within a year, the U.S. President got completely confused and said with irritation "I don't know, I don't know."

Shying away from a further debate on this issue, the President hurried to reduce the whole matter to the point that the Soviet Union had allegedly outpaced the United States and that the latter should catch up with it. This contention of the President is in conflict with the real state of affairs. This is borne out, among other things, by the figures released at one time by international institutes of defense studies in various countries, which show that the United States set off one third more explosions than the Soviet Union.

President Reagan's rejection of the Soviet proposal on the moratorium and a total ban on nuclear tests is added proof that the U.S. Administration's line on disarmament issues is to go ahead with the modernization of its nuclear arsenals, conducting tests and building up the arms race.

Noteworthy is the fact that at the end of the press conference a White House official spokesman made "clarifications" concerning Reagan's statements, which imparted an even tougher interpretation to his rejection of the moratorium. The White House spokesman made a point of stressing that Reagan did not come up with any new initiative and that the United States intends to go on with the modernisation of its armaments.

At the press conference the President was also asked questions related to the anniversary of the U.S. bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Reagan responded, "We dropped the bomb in an effort to end what had been the greatest war in man's history. I think to say now that the decision should not have been taken is ridiculous." The words uttered by the President caused indignation among newsmen attending the press conference. In connection with this statement by Reagan, the U.S. press quotes Yasuhiro Nakasone, Japan's prime minister, as saying that the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were an inhuman act. Those were attacks on cities and the civilian population that contravened the norms of international law. That was the impermissible action. Politicians should make every effort to prevent the recurrence of anything similar.

#### PRAVDA Editorial Article

LD061917 Moscow TASS in English 1907 GMT 6 Aug 85

["A Responsible Approach Is Needed"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, August 6 TASS -- The newspaper PRAVDA in its issue of August 7 publishes the editorial article [identified by Moscow TASS International Service in Russian as "redaktisionnaya staiya"] which says:

As was announced by General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, M.S. Gorbachev, a unilateral moratorium on any nuclear explosions is in effect in the Soviet Union. It was introduced till January 1, 1986, but -- and it should be especially emphasized -- will continue to remain in force if the United States, for its part, does not conduct nuclear explosions. In other words, there now exists a realistic possibility for the moratorium to become bilateral, for both great powers to stop nuclear explosions.

The invitation to follow the step made by the Soviet Union had been officially handed over to the government of the U.S.A. before it was published.

This joint measure would become in itself not only a major step toward limiting the arms race, but also a convincing example for other states that possess nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union has long taken up and consistently stands by the question of the imperative need of complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests. And the faster the answer is found to that question the sooner a stout barrier will be put up in the way of the arms race. Moreover, the complete and general prohibition of nuclear tests would mean a turn toward practical elimination of nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union has repeatedly urged all nuclear powers to fulfil that task through joint efforts. Motivated by the desire to reach agreement, it conducted talks with the United States and Britain which, however, suspended them. The Soviet Union today is ready to resume those talks immediately.

Proposing to open talks, the Soviet Union has now taken a bold decision. Yet another time it took the initiative. Nuclear explosions are not produced in the Soviet Union and will not be produced if silence descends upon nuclear test ranges in the United States.

It would seem that the U.S. Government, if it really takes heed of the sentiment of the American and world public, should use the opportunity coming its way and stop nuclear explosions too. However, it looks like such a prospect caused confusion in Washington, where they feverishly began to look for and invent different kinds of excuses for evading the acceptance of the Soviet proposal. In essence the U.S. Administration, having taken up perimeter defense, is expending energy on "fighting off" the onslaught of demands that the idea of introducing a moratorium on nuclear explosions be supported.

A set of propaganda cliches called upon to conceal that obstructionist stance was urgently put to use. High-ranking government officials began to rehash the given theme in a variety of voices.

Through sheer inertia the openers were usual: the practical and material measure, the true halt of nuclear explosions by the Soviet Union was announced to be a propaganda ploy. But why, then, does not the United States make the same 'propaganda move'?

Some pronouncements border on absurdity: it is alleged that, having decided to stop its tests, the Soviet Union wants to overtake the United States in nuclear arms.

First, how can one, having stopped, overtake anyone? Secondly, Washington is careful not to mention that the U.S.A. has carried out at least 1/3 more nuclear weapon tests than the Soviet Union.

And by way of the last resort which the American side customarily uses when it wants to dodge constructive Soviet proposals, the thesis to the effect is that it is allegedly impossible to verify the observance of a moratorium on nuclear explosions was again put into circulation. But it is clear even to a layman that a nuclear blast is not a child's cracker and one cannot miss or fail to hear it.

As to expert opinion on this matter, prominent American scientists recently bluntly told Congress that reliable verification, out of all arms control measures, is best applied to nuclear explosions. This has been confirmed by such an informed figure as former CIA director Colby. Compliance with a moratorium on nuclear blasts, as he put it, can be undoubtedly ensured with the help of existing national technical means of control.

The point at issue, however, is not control -- far from control, but that they in Washington continue to stick stubbornly to the course toward continuing the race of armaments, building up nuclear arsenals and perfecting nuclear weapons.

U.S. President Ronald Reagan confirmed this at his press conference on August 5. He said that the United States would continue nuclear weapon tests and there could be no talk about a moratorium on its part until it had completed its testing programme.

Some people may get the impression that the United States may agree to the termination of nuclear tests some time in the near future. The President himself dispelled the illusions of this kind, bluntly mentioning specifically, the tests connected with the programme of developing the Midgetman missile, intended till the end of the eighties. Moreover, in order to make all the things even clearer, the White House spokesman hastily complemented the President's remarks by specifying that the 'control issue' should be resolved and the United States should first modernize its armaments.

At the same time, Washington is busy lashing the waves, publicizing the 'merits' of the idea of conducting its nuclear blasts in the presence of Soviet observers. They want nothing less than that the Soviet Union, which unilaterally stopped nuclear explosions, 'bless' American nuclear weapons tests by sending its observers to Nevada testing grounds.

The United States shows once again that it is not seeking to discuss in a businesslike and concrete way, and most important, to resolve practically the issues related to the nuclear arms limitation. It is not only unprepared to leave the road of the arms race, but is bent on spreading it to outer space. By the way, Pentagon specialists acknowledge that for that, too, they need nuclear tests. This posture does not lend weight to the peace rhetoric used time and again by American statesmen.

In full view of the world, the United States demonstrates disregard for the peoples' interests, for the interests of international security. A responsible approach is expected from Washington. It should realize the risks which accompany the continuation by the United States of the militarist course and take advantage of the opportunity offered by the Soviet Union's proposal to stop nuclear explosions.

CSO: 5200/1347



NUCLEAR TESTING

USSR HITS U.S. INVITATION TO OBSERVE TEST

'Clumsy Maneuver'

LD021605 Moscow TASS in English 1520 GMT 2 Aug 85

["Distracting Manoeuvre Instead of Response"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, August 2 TASS -- Political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov writes:

The more apparent it becomes that the new important Soviet initiative aimed at limiting and eventually eliminating mass destruction weapons draws the widest support of the international public, the more vigorously they in Washington try to shy away from the business-like response to the proposal to terminate any nuclear explosions. To cover up its negative stand, the U.S. Administration goes on zealously advertising its own "counter-initiative" the essence of which is that the United States is allegedly ready to invite Soviet observers to the latest tests of U.S. nuclear weapons.

One does not need to have any special knowledge to understand the essence of this so to say "counter-initiative." At the time when the USSR declares for halting the dangerous competition in building up nuclear arsenals, they in Washington, conversely, herald that they intend to increase these arsenals in the future as well and, moreover, would like to demonstrate to others the way it is done. In other words, Soviet observers are offered to look at and register the same nuclear explosions for the termination of which our country persistently calls. Moreover, they are putting on a serious face in an attempt to project this, according to THE WASHINGTON POST. "Invitation to breakfast in the desert with bombs" as all but a gesture of "good will"...

It is more than obvious now that Washington, which was informed in advance about the Soviet proposal to introduce a mutual moratorium on nuclear weapon tests, has hurriedly contrived a certain distracting manoeuvre which was actually put into play. A clumsy manoeuvre, to put it straight. There is no need to say that the so-called "counter-initiative" of the Washington administration, if realised, would mean an apparent encouragement of those who would like to go on working not towards lessening tensions and building up confidence but in the totally opposite direction.

Try to Forestall Moratorium

LD022017 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 2 Aug 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; publicist Vitaliy Kobysh commentary]

[Text] Announcer: The international movement, Physicians of the World for the Prevention of Nuclear War, has called upon the U.S. President to make a positive response to the peace initiative of the Soviet Union and introduce his own moratorium on nuclear tests. Here is Vitaliy Kobysh, a publicist:

Hello, Comrades! The statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, on the decision of the Soviet Union to unilaterally end nuclear explosions of any kind as of 6 August of this year has been responded to with joy and hope in people's hearts. I am not exaggerating. The attention of everyone, including the population of the United States, is now turned towards the American Administration. How, then, did official Washington respond? It has already been reported that in reply to the question: What will be the reply of the United States to the Soviet Union's proposal that it should join in the rejection of nuclear explosions? A spokesman of the administration put it clearly and precisely like this: The tests are going to go on.

This was perceived quite simply as a challenge to world public opinion. That was not all. In such a serious matter some administration representatives, on top of everything else, have allowed themselves to play some extremely superficial and unworthy propaganda games to put it mildly. Upon the instructions of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary, the report of the decision of the Soviet Union to declare a moratorium on nuclear explosions was transmitted to the American authorities in advance. In so doing the Soviet side was not simply following diplomatic etiquette, but proceeded on the basis of the extraordinary importance of the problem. So what happened? Having learned about our moratorium in good time and of the proposal that the United States should join in it, in Washington they hastily organized a press briefing with the sole purpose of forestalling the Soviet Union. At this McFarlane, assistant to the president on national security, solemnly announced that the administration had decided to invite Soviet observers to one of the nuclear explosions in the State of Nevada.

Journalists present at the briefing did not know whether to be surprised or to laugh. The Soviet Union announces an end to nuclear explosions, and the Washington leadership kindly invites observers from our country to be present when American nuclear explosions are carried out. It is difficult to believe this, but some people in the White House still believe that they have made a very crafty and cunning move there. First of all, they've forestalled the Russians. Point two, they've given them an invitation. Consequently, the United States is an open society. But what have they forestalled it with? By announcing very promptly that they have no intention of giving up nuclear explosions. What is it that they have issued invitations to, and why? To observe how the United States is implementing its aggressive military programs which rely upon nuclear weapons. Why should one have to go anywhere to convince oneself of that? Everyone knows a great deal about them already. This has once again been confirmed by Paul Warnke. During the Carter administration, as head of the American delegation, he conducted talks on arms control. The present U.S. Administration has no desire for a ban on tests of nuclear weapons. It has no interest in arms control, Paul Warnke stated. That's all there is to it. That is how things stand in Washington.

CSO: 5200/1347

27 August 1985

## NUCLEAR TESTING

## SOVIET OFFICIALS HOLD PRESS CONFERENCE ON MORATORIUM

## Moscow Television Coverage

LD012056 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 1 Aug 85

[Text] In Moscow today, at the USSR Foreign Ministry's Press Center, a news conference was held for Soviet and foreign journalists in connection with the new major foreign policy initiative put forth by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee [video shows, from left to right, Korniyenko, Zamyatin and Chervov standing on platform] The news conference was opened by Comrade Zamyatin, head of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee.

The floor for an opening statement was given to Comrade Korniyenko, first deputy USSR minister of foreign affairs.

[Begin Korniyenko recording] As you know, on 29 July, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev announced the Soviet Union's decision to unilaterally halt, starting from 6 August, any nuclear explosions. He called upon the government of the United States to act similarly and halt, from the same date, American nuclear explosions. It is now up to the United States.

The exceptional importance of the step taken by the Soviet Union is already shown by the fact that this decision has received such wide and approving acclaim throughout the world. What importance does the halting of nuclear weapons tests have? One does not have to be an expert in military affairs to realize that tests are a kind of accelerator of the nuclear arms race.

Indeed, it is with the help of tests that the development of new kinds and types of these weapons of mass destruction, and also the perfecting of existing systems are affected. A halt to tests, however, would be a powerful measure which would put a sharp brake on this whole process. Effectively, without tests the nuclear arms race would in time become impossible. That is the gist of the Soviet policy directed at a complete and universal ban on nuclear weapons tests.

Furthermore, a halt to tests is also a way to liquidate nuclear arsenals already stockpiled. For if there are no tests, and consequently, too, no modernization of existing nuclear arms, then they will, experts are well aware of this, gradually lose their effect and eventually die out. This would be a reliable guarantee for averting nuclear war.

Consistently striving towards this goal, the Soviet Union, in 1955, exactly 30 years ago, appealed to all states possessing atomic and hydrogen weapons, with the proposal to pledge to halt tests of such weapons. Unfortunately, because of the negative position of the Western powers, that proposal was not implemented. But the Soviet Union continued to exert efforts in this direction and they played a decisive role in the conclusion in 1963 of the treaty on banning tests of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, outer space and underwater. I would like to stress that the Soviet Union even then was in favor of halting all tests, including underground ones. But the United States, Britain, and France did not go along with this. Therefore, the task of a complete halt to tests of nuclear weapons remains unresolved to this day.

A definite advance on this issue, it seems, was achieved in 1974 when the USSR and the United States signed a treaty limiting the power of underground tests of nuclear weapons, and then in 1976, a treaty regulating peaceful nuclear explosions.

The fact that these treaties have not been ratified is not our fault. Again it is necessary to stress that during those years, too, the USSR advocated the complete and universal halting of nuclear weapons testing. Following the so-called Threshold Test Ban Treaty signed in 1974 by the Soviet Union and the United States, we submitted a draft multilateral treaty on the complete banning of nuclear tests to the UN General Assembly in 1975. The overwhelming majority of states supported our proposal, apart from those on whom its implementation depended first and foremost. So, a universal halting of nuclear weapons tests has been and remains our goal.

A certain ray of hope appeared, as it were, in 1977, when tripartite talks involving the USSR, the United States, and Britain began at our initiative. Their aim was to draw up a treaty on the complete and universal banning of nuclear weapons tests. During the 3 years that the talks went on, considerable progress was made in the drafting of such a treaty. But in November 1980, the United States, followed by Britain, refused to continue these talks; and it is not difficult to understand why. There is just one explanation for the, the aspiration of the present U.S. Administration to upset the existing balance of forces and to achieve superiority.

The U.S. new, large-scale military programs for the development and improvement of nuclear, conventional, and, finally, space armaments are aimed at this. However, it should be clear that the continuation of the arms race is a hopeless course. It leads only to a destabilization of the current situation, the pointless waste of resources, and an increased threat of war for all, including its initiators. The need for urgent, practical measures to break the vicious circle of the arms race is now greater than ever before. We believe that one such measure, and a very important one, is precisely the halting of nuclear weapons tests. If the United States were to follow the Soviet Union in doing this, it would be an example to other states with nuclear weapons.

I hope that the U.S. Government has not yet said its final word in response to this new manifestation of good will by the Soviet Union, and that the United States will join the moratorium on nuclear explosions which the Soviet Union has announced. This is a problem whose solution would accord with the aspirations and vital interests of all the peoples. [end recording]

The participants in the news conference then answered journalists' questions.

[Begin Zamyatin recording] I should like to answer a question asked by Comrade (Gremme), the correspondent for ADN, the GDR'S telegraphic agency. His question is: What can you say about the main trends in the world and the appraisals and the nature of the reaction to the new Soviet initiative, including those in the United States?

I want to say that the most important thing is that politicians and public forces which advocate averting the nuclear threat and restricting and liquidating the arms race see in this Soviet initiative proposed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev a real chance of coming to a rapid agreement and ending all nuclear tests and I stress, to all nuclear tests.

As far as the position of the U.S. Administration is concerned, no official reply has so far been received to the Soviet proposal. The public reaction by U.S. officials cannot be called constructive. In essence they are evading our proposal and are upholding the continuation by the United States of its nuclear weapon tests. I must say that they are unable to give convincing arguments in favor of their position: simply, there are none.

The majority of people in the world do not share such an approach. Statements by the representatives of many countries, parties, and public organizations in various forms contain one thing: approval of the important major Soviet initiative and a demand that the U.S. Administration give a constructive reply to it. It is being pointed out that the nature of the U.S. Administration's reply to the present proposal will show in full whether Washington really wants to work toward disarmament and to strive for agreement, or whether Washington will continue to make peace-loving speeches yet act in a negative way at negotiations on the disarmament issue as a whole. That is the essence of world reaction to the proposal by the USSR. [end recording]

Now for the second question to Georgiy Markovich Korniyenko.

[Begin Korniyenko recording] Spokesmen for the U.S. Administration say that the impossibility of monitoring the moratorium is the main reason for its negative attitude to the moratorium. What can you say about this?

First of all, the argument about control is indeed being put forward on this occasion too, which in general has become the rule in Washington whenever they want to get out of this or that proposal in the area of limiting armaments and disarmament.

Meanwhile not only Soviet, but also prominent American scientists and specialists unambiguously reject this artificial argument. It is sufficient, for example to quote Mr Colby, former director of the CIA, who a few days ago stated bluntly that the observance of a moratorium on nuclear explosions without doubt can be ensured with the help of existing national technical means of control. That is how the matter stands regarding control. [end recording]

Begin recording] [Zamyatin] I would like to give the floor for a question to (Andrzej Bojowik), a correspondent of the Polish ZYCIE WARSZAWY.

[Bojowik, in Russian] As you know there is an American proposal that Soviet observers take part in one of the American nuclear weapons tests. Could you say what reply can be expected from the Soviet side?

[Korniyenko] I rather think that it is not difficult to imagine what the answer will be. Why should Soviet representatives go there in order, so to speak, to sanctify these tests by their presence? I think there can hardly be anyone, even in Washington, who is seriously counting on this. Nuclear explosions should be stopped, rather than inviting people to observe how they are carried out. I would add that the matters under discussion here are too serious to attempt to reduce things to propaganda tricks.

[Zamyatin] The American paper THE WASHINGTON POST, in my view, today wrote well on this question: It said that while the Soviet Union is inviting the U.S. President to a peace dinner, the American president is inviting the Soviet Union to a nuclear luncheon. I think this reflects the point of view that we share on this issue. [end recording]

[Announcer] A question for Colonel General Chervov, head of a directorate of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces.

[Begin recording] [Zamyatin] If the Soviet Union comes out for the ratification of the treaties of 1974 and 1976 on underground nuclear explosions, then why is it against now engaging in amending the clauses contained in them on control, as it proposed by the United States?

[Chervov] There is no necessity for such amendments. The U.S. proposal in this regard is unfounded. Current national-technical means of control make it possible for both sides, with sufficient accuracy and reliability, to monitor nuclear explosions. More than that, the United States, by virtue of special geographical conditions, has greater opportunities for control than the Soviet Union.

In addition, the 1974 treaty provides for an entire mechanism and system of control, which has not as yet been put into operation. In particular, it provides for an exchange of data on calibration explosions and an exchange of data on the geology of test sites, as well as other things. This control mechanism, which was laid down in the 1974 treaty, has not yet been checked in practice, and the American side is already saying that it is a poor one. Meanwhile, if the treaty were ratified and this control mechanism were put into operation, the possibilities of both sides for control would be considerably increased. So it is a matter not of control but of the intention of the United States not to ratify the treaties and to continue to carry out its extensive program for testing nuclear weapons.

[Zamyatin] Will you ask your question please.

[Unidentified KUNA journalist, in Russian] Kuwaiti news agency KUNA: My question is: The whole world knows that the Soviet Union has for some years made a great many positive initiatives for preservation of peace, but the United States seems to turn a deaf ear and has never answered them. So, what will the Soviet Union do in future? Will it again propose new initiatives, or what?

[Korniyenko] [Laughter] It can, with every certitude, be said that yes, we will continue our efforts directed at halting the arms race, at averting nuclear war. To sit back and do nothing is not our philosophy, and you will not avert nuclear war that way. But experience shows that nevertheless, at times it has proved possible to reach extremely important accords. We are hoping for the victory of good sense, that it will gain the upper hand also in those countries where it is not very much in evidence. And so our efforts will continue and we will even step them up. [end recording]

[Announcer] The participants in the press conference also answered other questions from journalists.

27 August 1985

## TASS Reports Questions and Answers

LD011622 Moscow TASS in English 1556 GMT 1 Aug 85

[Text] Moscow, August 1 TASS -- A question was asked at the press conference: If the Soviet Union stands for the ratification of the 1974 and 1976 treaties on underground nuclear explosions, why is it against setting down now to revising the provisions on verification formulated by those treaties, thus making the U.S. proposal?

There is no need at all for such a revision, Nikolay Chervov replied. The U.S. proposal is unjustified. The Soviet Union stands for the ratification of the above treaties without any revisions of the verification provisions. The present-day national technical means enable both sides to monitor very accurately and dependably nuclear explosions. Moreover, the United States has better verification possibilities than the Soviet Union by virtue of geographic conditions.

The 1974 treaty stipulates a whole system of verification, including exchanges of information about reference explosions and the geology of testing sites.

The American side, without having checked that verification system in practice, claims that it is bad. Meanwhile, if the treaty was ratified and the verification system envisioned in it put into effect, the possibilities to monitor nuclear tests would be even better.

The point therefore is not verification but the U.S. intention not to put the treaties signed by it into effect and to carry on an extensive program of testing nuclear weapons.

Nikolay Chervov described as groundless the assertions by U.S. representatives that one of the reasons why they do not back the Soviet Union's moratorium proposal is that the USSR conducted a big series of tests this year.

In the first half of the year, the United States and the Soviet Union conducted an equal number of nuclear blasts, he said. As to general statistics, according to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, the United States has conducted by now roughly thirty per cent more nuclear blasts than the Soviet Union, and jointly with other western nuclear powers -- 150 per cent more.

On the assertion by the U.S. President's National Security Adviser Robert McFarlane that the USSR advances moratorium proposals only when this gives it unilateral benefits, Leonid Zamyatin said that the Soviet Union is not seeking a military superiority over the United States and is not looking for unilateral advantages. This has been repeatedly declared by Soviet leaders. As to Washington, a kind of trend has emerged there to respond negatively to any Soviet initiatives, especially when the point at issue are problems of ending or restricting the arms race.

Here are some examples. At the Geneva talks on nuclear and space armaments, the Soviet Union advanced a whole number of concrete constructive proposals, including the proposal for introducing a reciprocal moratorium on nuclear and space arms. This was done, he said, in order to make it easier to achieve accords on the entire range of issues. Introducing a moratorium on nuclear and space arms is viewed by the Soviet Union only as a first step towards cutting nuclear armaments -- both in the delivery vehicles and war-

heads. This is confirmed by our proposal that, once the moratorium is introduced, the sides table concrete proposals at the talks, say, within one or two months, on the levels to which they would be ready to cut strategic offensive armaments, naturally, along with the prohibition of space strike weapons. Who benefits from that, and who loses, one might ask? This is mutually beneficial, if the aim is to achieve accords, Leonid Zamyatin said.

A reminder should be made of one more important Soviet action, the unilateral obligation of the USSR not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. We called upon the USA to follow our example. The United States persists in this matter, too, wishing to bolster its "right" to unleash nuclear war. This is not only our view. For instance, former U.S. Defence Secretary Robert McNamara confirmed at a press conference in Washington the other day that the SDI program of the Reagan administration was clearly aimed at ensuring invulnerability for the United States after it had delivered the first nuclear strike.

So, turning down Soviet proposals, the United States remains the initiator of new and new rounds of the arms race, and is seeking military superiority. But this approach by no means strengthens the security of the USA and its allies, Leonid Zamyatin concluded.

It was explained at the press conference why the proposal on a moratorium on nuclear explosions had been made by the Soviet Union at this moment.

A reply to this question, it was pointed out, was supplied by Mikhail Gorbachev's statement itself. It stresses that the continued nuclear arms race was fraught with enormous dangers to the future of the whole of world civilisation. It is leading to the escalation of tension and the military threat, distracting colossal intellectual and material resources from constructive goals.

It was noted that the Soviet Union believed that the nuclear arms race which had swept the world could be stopped. An end to nuclear weapons tests is an effective measure in this direction. A halt in nuclear explosions will "freeze" the technology of nuclear munitions and therefore check the process of the development of their new types, and also put a brake on the development of new types and systems of nuclear delivery vehicles. Simultaneously, nuclear munitions could be cut back quantitatively as they grow outdated and, in the longer term, nuclear weapons could go out of existence.

In brief, stopping nuclear explosions -- as proposed in Mikhail Gorbachev's statement -- is one of the reliable ways leading towards cuts in nuclear arsenals and their total elimination.

It was also stressed that ending nuclear tests would objectively have a favourable effect from the standpoint of curtailing the race of nuclear armaments. That is why, if the United States also embarked on the same road, there would be far more chances that that other nuclear powers also would find it possible to give up nuclear weapons tests without fearing that the United States and the USSR might advance far ahead in building up and perfecting their nuclear arsenals.

All this undoubtedly would make it easier to work out and conclude a treaty on a comprehensive ban on nuclear weapon tests for all time.



On the Helsinki meeting between the Soviet foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state, Georgy Korniyenko said that the discussions, the exchange of views held in Helsinki are assessed by us, and, as far as we know, by the American side as useful, frank and necessary. I think it is early to talk now about the results of the discussion. How to overcome difficulties in working out an agenda? The point is not working out a formal agenda. Overcoming the difficulties, rather, getting results from summit meetings will depend on whether the American side will be prepared, as we are prepared, to consider at the meeting first of all issues related to the security of our countries and international security, and whether United States policy will meet the aim of strengthening international security and will not directly contradict this.

A question was asked about the Soviet Union's attitude to a joint statement by the heads of state and government, parties to the Delhi declaration, on the 40th anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima. They stated that they will multiply their efforts in order to attain the goals set forth by the Delhi declaration, including on a universal prohibition of tests, production and deployment of nuclear weapons and delivery systems.

It was stressed that the Soviet Union's attitude to the Delhi declaration was favourable, that this is an important international document. Our country backs provisions of the declaration and actively supports it.

The new appeal by the heads of state and government from the six countries -- India, Sweden, Tanzania, Greece, Mexico and Argentina -- in advance of the day of remembrance of Hiroshima victims is a noble initiative reminding the world of the need to strive for accords on issues of terminating the race of nuclear armaments. We support this posture.

It was said in conclusion at the press conference: There are all conditions for implementing the Soviet proposal. The main thing is that the United States give a positive response to the new Soviet initiative. This would be a real step towards lessening international tension, would meet the aspirations of peoples of all countries.

#### Fuller Report on Questions and Answers

PM021529 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Aug 85 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Important New Soviet Initiative; Press Conference in Moscow"]

[Excerpt] The press conference participants answered journalists' questions.

Questions: M.S. Gorbachev's statement has generated a wide reaction in the world. How do you assess the nature of the reaction to the new Soviet initiative, including the reaction of the United States?

Answer: The main thing is that the politicians and social forces which advocate averting the nuclear threat and the limitation and elimination of the arms race see this Soviet initiative put forward by Comrade M.S. Gorbachev as a real chance to rapidly reach agreement and put a stop to all nuclear tests. This in turn means coming closer to nuclear disarmament in practice. It is no accident that the world is now turning to the precedent of the Moscow treaty concluded in 1963 banning tests in three environments: the atmosphere, space, and underwater. This treaty is operating effectively.

Most speeches by politicians, and that includes in the United States itself, demand that the U.S. Administration stop holding underground nuclear tests and enshrine this in a treaty.

As for the U.S. Administration's position, no official reply to the Soviet proposal has yet been received. The public reaction of U.S. official spokesmen cannot be deemed constructive. They are basically shunning our proposal and defending continued U.S. tests of their nuclear weapons.

I must say that they cannot cite any convincing arguments in favor of their position; there simply are none. That is why they want to put discussion of the Soviet initiative on a false footing. Specifically, they are claiming that adoption of the Soviet proposal will consolidate the USSR's unilateral advantage in the military sphere.

This is being said by those who would like the United States to retain the opportunity to improve its nuclear weapons, which means continuing the nuclear arms race.

Most people in the world do not share that approach. In different forms the statements by representatives of many countries contain approval of the important Soviet initiative and at the same time demand that the U.S. Administration reply constructively to it. That is the essence of the world reaction to the USSR's proposal.

Question: U.S. Administration spokesmen are stating that the main reason for their negative attitude to the moratorium is the impossibility of monitoring its observance. What could you say on that score?

Answer: Indeed, the monitoring argument is being put forward this time too, which has generally become the rule in Washington when people over there want to dodge certain proposals in the arms limitation and disarmament sphere.

Yet not only Soviet but eminent American scientists and specialists unequivocally reject this farfetched argument. One need only cite, for instance, Mr Colby, former CIA director, who stated outright the other day that observance of a moratorium on nuclear explosions "could undoubtedly be ensured with the help of existing national technical monitoring means." That is how things stand as regards monitoring.

The real reason is something quite different. It can clearly be seen, for instance, in the official letter from the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency that was sent to the U.S. Congress in reply to a corresponding request. As an explanation of why the U.S. Government refuses to end nuclear tests the letter openly states: "Before this (that is, the ending of tests) would accord with the best interests of the United States, it would be necessary to resolve certain important problems."

Just what are these problems, one wonders? "Nuclear tests," the letter goes on to say, "are particularly necessary for developing, modernizing, and certifying warheads; for maintaining the reliability of existing stockpiles; and for assessing the consequences of the use of nuclear weapons."

That could obviously not be clearer. So, as you can see, monitoring has nothing to do with it. The fact is that the "best interests" of the United States, in the opinion of the current administration, are served by continuing rather than ending nuclear tests.

Question: It is reported that President Reagan proposed that Soviet representatives attend an American nuclear weapon test. Can we expect Soviet specialists to go to the United States to that end?

Answer: Why, one wonders, should Soviet representatives go to the United States? In order, so to speak, to bless the U.S. nuclear explosions with their presence? It is hardly likely that anyone in Washington would seriously count on that. Nuclear explosions must be stopped, rather than people being invited to watch them taking place. These matters are too serious to be reduced to that kind of propaganda act.

Question: M.S. Gorbachev's statement speaks of temporarily halting any nuclear explosions. Does this mean purely military explosions or is it also a question of explosions for peaceful purposes?

Answer: It is a question of stopping any nuclear explosions, be they military (that is, nuclear weapon tests) or peaceful.

Question: If the Soviet Union advocates the ratification of the 1974 and 1976 treaties on underground nuclear explosions, why does it oppose the provisions on monitoring contained in them being amended, as the United States is proposing?

Answer: There is no need for such amendments. The U.S. proposal is unjustified. The Soviet Union advocates the ratification of the aforesaid treaties without any amendments to the provisions on monitoring. Modern national technical means give both sides the capability to reliably monitor nuclear explosions with high accuracy. Moreover, the United States, by virtue of its geographic conditions, has greater monitoring potential than the Soviet Union.

The 1974 treaty envisages an entire system of monitoring, including the exchange of data on calibration explosions and the geology of test sites. The U.S. side is stating that this system is a bad one without having tested it in practice. Yet if the treaty were ratified and the monitoring system stipulated in it were brought into force the opportunity for monitoring nuclear tests would increase still further.

Therefore, it is not a question of monitoring, but of America's intention not to implement the treaties that have been signed and to continue a broad program of nuclear weapon tests.

Question: One reason why the United States does not support the Soviet proposal on a moratorium, it claims, is that the Soviet Union has carried out a major series of tests this year. Could you give us the relevant statistics?

Answer: In the first half-year the United States and the Soviet Union carried out an equal number of nuclear explosions. As for the total figure, according to the Stockholm Peace Research Institute's figures, the United States has at the present moment carried out approximately one-third more nuclear explosions than the Soviet Union. Taken together with the other Western nuclear powers the figure is 50 percent more.

Question: The U.S. president's National Security Adviser McFarlane has said that the Soviet Union proposes a moratorium only under circumstances which will give it a unilateral advantage. How do you view such arguments?

Answer: The Soviet Union does not strive for military superiority over the United States and does not seek unilateral advantages for itself. Soviet leaders have stated that many times. Washington has devised its own line of negative response to all Soviet initiatives, particularly with regard to problems of ending or limiting the arms race.

Let us give some examples. At the nuclear and space arms talks in Geneva the Soviet Union has put forward a whole series of concrete and constructive proposals, including a proposal on a reciprocal moratorium on nuclear and space arms. Why did it do that? So as to make it easier to reach accords on the whole package of questions. The Soviet Union regards highly the imposition of a moratorium on nuclear and space weapons, both delivery vehicles and charges. That is confirmed by our proposal that while establishing the moratorium the sides will, within, say 1-2 months, submit at the talks specific proposals including proposals on the levels to which they would be prepared to reduce strategic offensive armaments including, of course, the banning of space offensive arms. The question is: Who gains here and who loses? This is mutually beneficial if the sides strive to reach agreements.

Let us recall another very important Soviet action here, the USSR's unilateral commitment not to be first to use nuclear weapons. We have urged the United States to follow our example.

The United States is being stubborn here, wishing to hold on to its "right" to unleash nuclear war. That is not only our opinion. For example, former U.S. Defense Secretary R. McNamara confirmed at a press conference in Washington recently that the Reagan administration's SDI program is "clearly aimed at ensuring America's invulnerability after the United States delivers the first nuclear strike."

Thus, by rejecting the Soviet proposals, the United States continues to be the initiator of new rounds in the arms race and gambles on achieving military superiority. But such an approach by no means strengthens the security of the United States or its allies.

Question: Could you explain precisely why the proposal for a moratorium on nuclear explosions was put forward by the Soviet Union at this moment?

Answer: The answer to this question was given in M.S. Gorbachev's statement itself. The statement emphasizes that the continuation of the nuclear arms race is fraught with tremendous dangers for the future of the world's civilization as a whole. It leads to increasing tension and the intensification of the threat of war and diverts colossal intellectual and material resources from creative aims.

The Soviet Union believes that the nuclear arms race which has overwhelmed the world can be stopped. The halting of nuclear weapon tests is an effective step in this direction. Stopping nuclear explosions will "freeze" the nuclear munitions technology and, consequently, will halt the development of new models of these munitions and also the development of new kinds and types of nuclear means, that is, delivery vehicles. At the same time there would be a quantitative reduction in nuclear charges as they grow obsolete, and, in the longer term, nuclear weapons would die out.

In short, halting nuclear explosions, as proposed in M.S. Gorbachev's statement, is one reliable way toward a reduction in nuclear arsenals and their complete elimination.

Question: M.S. Gorbachev's statement points out that the introduction of the moratorium would create favorable conditions for the conclusion of an international treaty on a general and complete nuclear weapon test ban. What specific form would this take?

Answer: The favorable influence which the ending of nuclear tests would objectively exert from the viewpoint of the curtailment of the nuclear arms race has already been mentioned here. Therefore, if the United States also took this path there would be a much greater chance that other nuclear powers would also deem it possible to give up nuclear weapons tests without fear that the United States and the USSR will advance further still in the buildup and improvement of their nuclear arsenals.

All this would unquestionably facilitate the elaboration and conclusion of a treaty on a general and complete ban forever on nuclear weapon tests.

Question: How do you assess the results of the meeting in Helsinki between the USSR foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state? How, in your view will the difficulties in drawing up the agenda for the Geneva summit be overcome?

Answer: The discussion and exchange of views which took place in Helsinki are assessed by us, and as far as is known also by the U.S. side, as useful, frank and necessary. In my view it is too soon to talk about the results of this discussion. How will the difficulties in drawing up the agenda be overcome? It is not a matter of drawing up some kind of formal agenda.

Whether the difficulties will be overcome, or rather whether the meetings at summit level will be fruitful will depend on whether the U.S. side will be prepared, just as we are prepared, to discuss at the meeting, above all, questions which pertain to the security of our countries and to international security, and whether U.S. policy itself will be in keeping with the aim of strengthening international security or in direct contradiction to it.

Question: The Indian news agency has reported that in the joint statement adopted on the 40th anniversary of the dropping of the atom bomb on Hiroshima the heads of state and government who participated in the Delhi Declaration have stated that they will augment their efforts to achieve the goals defined by the Delhi Declaration, including the universal ending of the testing, production, and deployment of nuclear weapons and delivery systems. What is the Soviet Union's attitude to this?

Answer: The Soviet Union took a favorable attitude to the Delhi Declaration, which is an important international document. Our country shares the provisions of this declaration and actively supports it. The new appeal from the heads of state and government of six countries, India, Sweden, Tanzania, Greece, Mexico, and Argentina, on the eve of the memorial day for the victims of Hiroshima is a noble initiative reminding the world of the need to reach agreements on the questions of stopping the nuclear arms race. We support this position.

To conclude the press conference it was stated: All the conditions exist for the implementation of the Soviet proposal. The main thing is for the United States to react positively to the new Soviet initiative. This would be a real step toward easing international tension and would correspond to the aspirations of the peoples of all countries.

CSO: 5200/1347

## NUCLEAR TESTING

### SOVIET DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE DELEGATE ON MORATORIUM

#### Publicizes Gorbachev Statement

LD301537 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 30 Jul 85

[Text] At the Geneva conference on disarmament, the chief Soviet delegate, Viktor Israelyan, has made public the text of the statement by General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, on the Soviet Union's decision to suspend unilaterally any nuclear explosions as of the 6th of August. The moratorium will be effective until January 1st, 1986. It will remain in force if the United States, for its part, refrains from staging nuclear blasts.

Israelyan expressed confidence that the new move by the Soviet Union will help achieve genuine progress in the work to ban the tests of nuclear weapons.

#### Addresses Conference

LD062051 Moscow TASS in English 2033 GMT 6 Aug 85

[Text] Geneva, August 5 TASS -- Today's meeting of the Disarmament Conference is held on the day to which hardly anyone in the world is indifferent. The 40th anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima falls due today. Hiroshima's tragedy was soon shared by another Japanese city, Nagasaki. It is in the interest of all countries and peoples to prevent the repetition of that tragedy. USSR's representative Viktor Israelyan said this here, addressing a plenary meeting of the Disarmament Conference.

The first two nuclear explosives not only took the toll of some 300 thousand lives. Their impact is felt to this day, also in the sphere of international relations. The use of atomic bombs pursued not so much military, as purely political aims. The arms race combined with the aggravation of tension and cold war methods, such are the result of "nuclear diplomacy" over the four decades of its existence. It is not accidental that it was culminated in the programme of "star wars", the Soviet representative said.

The nuclear arms race is another ugly phenomenon engendered by the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It was started in a peculiar way -- only the United States was racing.

In the first four years of the nuclear epoch, the United States built up rather a solid arsenal of nuclear bombs, created an armada of strategic bombers and a web of bases from which actually any target in the Soviet Union could be reached.

August 6, 1985, the day on which the Soviet Union imposed a unilateral moratorium on any nuclear explosions could really become a new reference point, a new page in the chronicle of disarmament, Viktor Israelyan went on. The Soviet Union has been, is and will remain a resolute supporter of the ending of the nuclear arms race.

Our moratorium goes into effect today. It has been announced to last till January 1, 1986, but it will continue operating further, if the United States, on its part, keeps from staging nuclear explosions. There exist all the necessary conditions for the implementation of the new Soviet proposal. There is not doubt that a joint moratorium by the USSR and the USA on any nuclear explosions would set a good example to other states having nuclear weapons.

It would be a real step toward the easing of international tension, would meet the aspirations of peoples of all countries who are vitally interested in arresting the nuclear arms race that has swept the world. Starting from the implementation of such an effective feasible measure as an end to nuclear weapon tests, it could be achieved that the 40th anniversary of the nuclear arms race become the last major anniversary of the race, that it be stopped once and for ever, Viktor Israelyan said.

CSO: 5200/1347

NUCLEAR TESTING

USSR: REPORTS OF WORLD RESPONSE IN FAVOR OF MORATORIUM

U.S. Congressmen

LD310849 Moscow TASS in English 0817 GMT 31 Jul 85

[Text] Washington, July 31 TASS -- The Soviet Union's decision to stop unilaterally any nuclear explosions starting from August 6, 1985 announced by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, M.S. Gorbachev, makes it possible to put an end to nuclear weapon testing and stop the arms race, said Edward Markey, a member of the House of Representatives (Dem. -- Mass.) of the U.S. Congress. Speaking at a news conference in Congress, he stressed the importance and timeliness of that move at the time when huge stockpiles of nuclear weapons have been built up on earth. He urged the Reagan administration to examine seriously the issue of joining the moratorium introduced by the Soviet Union.

Patricia Schroeder, a member of the House of Representatives (Dem. -- Col.), said that the initiative announced by the Soviet leader made it possible to strengthen peace. She pointed to the need of resuming talks with a view to signing an international comprehensive test ban treaty, stressing that it would become a major step along the road toward agreement on the reduction of nuclear arsenals and would be helpful in terminating the lethally dangerous arms race.

The initiative put forth by the Soviet leader, said Gene LaRocque, rear admiral, USN (retired), director of the Center for Defense Information, was an opportunity to prevent nuclear war. Everyone stands to gain from accepting the USSR's proposal aimed at terminating the nuclear arms race.

Alan Cranston

LD301011 Moscow TASS in English 0937 GMT 30 Jul 85

[Text] Washington, July 30 TASS -- The Soviet Union's decision to stop unilaterally any nuclear blasts starting from August six this year, announced by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, is viewed by realistically-minded American legislators as a positive and major step towards reducing the threat of nuclear war.

The Soviet Union, stressed prominent American politician, Deputy Leader of the Senate Democratic Minority Alan Cranston (Democrat, California), made a good proposal which should be accepted by the United States. The issue of preventing nuclear war is very serious, the senator observed.



U.N. General Secretary

LD301856 Moscow TASS in English 1818 GMT 30 Jul 85

[Text] New York, July 30 TASS -- The United Nations Secretary General, Javier Perez de Cuellar, highly appraised the Soviet Union's decision, announced by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, M.S. Gorbachev, to suspend unilaterally any nuclear explosions starting from August 6, 1985. The international community attaches the greatest importance to agreement on a comprehensive test ban, says a statement issued by Javier Perez De Cuellar today at the United Nations headquarters. All steps leading in the direction of the ultimate achievement of that goal are most welcome and should be encouraged. The complete and permanent cessation of nuclear testing is in the basic interest of all nations and peoples.

On the eve of the 40th anniversary of the first use of atomic weapons, I wish to reiterate, Javier Perez De Cuellar goes on, my appeal for renewed efforts by all nuclear-weapon states towards a comprehensive test ban treaty. No other multilateral agreement could better indicate their willingness to slow down gradually the arms race and pursue significant arms limitation and disarmament measures, stresses the United Nations secretary general.

Portuguese Communist Party

LD301652 Moscow TASS in English 1621 GMT 30 Jul 85

[Excerpt] Moscow, July 30 TASS -- Alvaro Cunhal, general secretary of the Portuguese Communist Party, has described the statement by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee announcing the USSR'S commitment to introduce unilaterally a moratorium on conducting nuclear blasts as a concrete step in the work for peace. The Portuguese communist leader was speaking today at the press centre of the 12th World Festival of Youth and Students, which is in its fourth day today in the Soviet capital.

Nicaraguan Deputy Minister

LD301858 Moscow TASS in English 1658 GMT 30 Jul 85

["Festival: This is a Sincere and Bold Gesture" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, July 30 TASS -- "If the United States follows the Soviet Union's example and refrains from staging nuclear blasts we will greet the return of common sense to the policy pursued by the White House," it was stated today by Nicaragua's Deputy Minister of Internal Affairs Omar Cabezas who is a guest of honour of the festival's international preparatory committee.

When commenting at the forum's press centre on Mikhail Gorbachev's statement about the introduction of a moratorium on nuclear explosions, he stressed that the Soviet Union's new peace step testifies to its high sense of moral responsibility for the future of mankind, to its striving to stop the arms race on earth and in outer space.

"Mikhail Gorbachev's statement is a sincere and at the same time bold gesture", Omar Cabezas said. "If the United States Administration does not emulate it the whole world will see who strives for peace and who today comes out as a force of aggression and war."

"The Soviet Union's moratorium", he said in conclusion, "is a good example for countries that have nuclear arms and countries that strive to possess them".

Nonaligned Coordination Bureau

LD310454 Moscow TASS in English 0448 GMT 31 Jul 85

[Text] New York, July 31 TASS -- The Soviet Union's decision to unilaterally suspend any nuclear explosions, starting from August 6 this year, which was announced by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, largely facilitates attainment of accords on prohibition for all time of any nuclear tests, a TASS correspondent has been told by Acting Chairman of the Coordination Bureau of the nonaligned countries V. Verma (India). The international community, he said, highly appreciates the clear and concrete initiatives of the Soviet Union which believes that the task of ending nuclear weapons tests could and should be resolved. The nonaligned states regard the new step on the part of the USSR as yet another proof of its determination to remove the nuclear threat which hangs over the world.

News, Peace Organizations

OW301459 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1135 GMT 30 Jul 85

[From the "World Today" program presented by Valeriy Korzin]

[Excerpt] Now our country has again advanced another proposal: Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, announced the decision of the Soviet Union to unilaterally end any nuclear explosions on 6 August this year.

Since early this morning, we have been receiving responses to this initiative, which is clear to every person in the world who is interested in peace. (Michael Meyerson), executive director of the U.S. Peace Council, stated: The decision of the Soviet Union again attests to the fact that the USSR does not limit itself to declarations about a desire for peace, but takes concrete steps in this direction. He said: I am certain that all participants in the antiwar movement and all Americans desirous of peace will welcome this announcement. The American people have the right to demand a positive reaction to the Soviet initiative from the Reagan administration and an end by the United States to its own nuclear tests. This step would prevent further modernization of nuclear weapons and facilitate an end to the arms race.

The KYODO news service assesses the decision to unilaterally end nuclear explosions announced by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee as testimony of an ardent desire by the Soviet Union for peace and the elimination of nuclear arms. The news service notes: The Soviet leader indicated that an end to all nuclear weapon tests would be an important contribution to strengthening strategic stability and peace on earth. Enumerating the constructive steps recently taken by the Soviet Union in the sphere of disarmament and preventing the threat of thermonuclear war, the KYODO news service calls this complex of measures a USSR peace offensive.

(Gordon Shafer), well-known public figure and vice president of the British Peace Assembly, said that the historic decision of the Soviet Union to unilaterally end nuclear explosions is a sincere peace-loving act and yet another energetic attempt to ward off the threat of war to the world. The new peace initiative is particularly topical now, when the U.S. Administration is hatching plans for the militarization of space and striving to raise the arms race to a qualitatively new level. He emphasized: In these conditions sensible political and public figures in Western states, and primarily the United States, must immediately demand that Washington follow the example of the Soviet Union.

#### World Peace Council

LD011526 Moscow TASS in English 1130 GMT 1 Aug 85

[Text] Helsinki, August 1 TASS -- The World Peace Council issued a statement in conjunction with the approaching 40th anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

On the eve of the 40th anniversary of the American atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki a step of historic importance was made along the road toward world peace: The Soviet Union unilaterally introduced a moratorium on all nuclear tests till January 1, 1986, urging all other nuclear-weapon states to follow that gesture of goodwill, the statement says. The Soviet Union also decided not to resume the testing after January 1 if the United States also refrains from conducting them. Millions of people belonging to all political trends and living around the world welcome that act of peace.

The termination of all nuclear explosions and the conclusion of a treaty on the prohibition of nuclear tests is a top priority demand of the world public and the United Nations, the statement says. The World Peace Council urges all nuclear-weapon powers, primarily the United States, to follow the example of the USSR that historic act should be met with the readiness to agree to a compromise in attaining nuclear disarmament. It is time for all nations to rally together and pave the way toward the termination of all nuclear tests, by urging all nuclear-weapon states to observe the 40th anniversary of the events in Hiroshima and Nagasaki with the adoption of the same obligations which the Soviet Union assumed.

Today the U.S. Administration, working to realize "star wars" plans which can lead to a nuclear holocaust on this planet, is beginning to project the arms race to space. Mankind is faced with the threat of global destruction, the statement says.

The World Peace Council urges all national movements working for peace and disarmament to observe the 40th anniversary of the American atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki by redoubling their efforts to ensure that the opportunity provided by the Soviet Union be used. Let not a single state resume nuclear testing after August 6, 1985.

Austrian Socialist

LD050711 Moscow TASS in English 0650 GMT 5 Aug 85

[Text] Vienna, August 5 TASS -- The initiative of the Soviet Union which has decided to stop unilaterally any nuclear explosions deserves very close attention and should be welcomed in every way, Walter Hacker, prominent figure of the Socialist Party of Austria and secretary of the Socialist International Advisory Council on Disarmament, has stated.

He stressed that this step was very important for the success of the efforts exerted with a view to achieve the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The termination of the tests would also help to put an end to the improvement of mass-destruction weapons.

Fidel Castro

LD061241 Moscow TASS in English 1227 GMT 6 Aug 85

[Text] Havana, August 6 TASS -- The First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba, Chairman of the State Council and Council of Ministers of the Republic of Cuba Fidel Castro described the Soviet Union's decision to stop unilaterally all nuclear explosions starting August 6, 1985 as an important step in the cause of preserving and strengthening peace. Speaking at a press conference here, he said that any measure leading to the strengthening of peace and relaxation of international tension was of much importance. The Soviet Union's decision is new evidence of its good will, the Cuban leader stressed. But the United States remains deaf to this call.

Soviet Trade Unions

LD062205 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1720 GMT 6 Aug 85

[Text] Moscow, 6 Aug (TASS) -- The tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki has today become the will and the conscience of all mankind. It resounds as a passionate call to the struggle against the nuclear threat which hangs over the world, says an AUCCTU statement in connection with the 40th anniversary of the American atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Today, when the nuclear-missile arms race unleashed by the aggressive militarist forces of the U.S. has reached an unprecedented scale and threatens to spread to outer space, it is vital to double, to triple the joint actions of all the peace-loving forces of the world in the struggle against nuclear madness.

As M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee noted in his reply to the address by the Japanese council of organizations of atom bomb victims, the Soviet Union has been persistently striving for the liquidation of nuclear weapons since the time of their inception. The USSR is ready at any moment to embark on nuclear disarmament if an appropriate accord is reached with the other nuclear powers. The Soviet Union is consistently holding this position at the Geneva talks.

The USSR has committed itself not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. In M.S. Gorbachev's recent statement a new extremely important peace initiative was put forward, a moratorium was unilaterally declared on all nuclear blasts commencing 6 August, the day of the Hiroshima tragedy. This decision meets the hopes and aspirations of the working people and the peoples of all countries for attaining lasting peace. It has met with the broad approval and support of the world's public.

The readiness of the U.S. and the other nuclear powers to follow this example would be a real contribution to strengthening peace on earth and a tribute to the memory of the victims of the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The AUCCTU, on behalf of millions of members of Soviet trade unions, has expressed the firm conviction that, with the joint efforts of the working people and of all the peace-loving forces, our planet will be saved from a nuclear holocaust. The tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki must never happen again anywhere in the world!

CSO: 5200/1347

NUCLEAR TESTING

SOVIET UN MISSION HOLDS PRESS CONFERENCE ON MORATORIUM

LD021902 Moscow TASS in English 1845 GMT 2 Aug 85

[Text] New York, August 2 TASS -- A press conference of the USSR mission to the United Nations Organisation, held at the headquarters of the international community, was devoted to the new peace initiative of the Soviet Union which decided to stop unilaterally all nuclear explosions starting this August 6th.

It was noted at the press conference that the Soviet Union's decision, announced by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, opens the road to liquidating nuclear arsenals, scaling down and then ending the arms race.

When answering questions, Deputy Chief Soviet delegate to the United Nations Vladimir Shustov noted the groundlessness of allegations by Western propaganda that the USSR had completed a new round of underground tests and for this reason announced a moratorium on them. "If the United States joins the Soviet proposal we are prepared to observe the moratorium for as long as needed," he said. "Urgent measures to break the vicious circle of the nuclear arms race have never been more necessary. And the termination of all nuclear tests is one of such measures. If the United States joined the Soviet Union this would serve as an example to other nuclear powers," the Soviet representative stressed.

CSO: 5200/1347

27 August 1985

## NUCLEAR TESTING

## TASS CONDEMNS NAKASONE REACTION TO MORATORIUM

LD021640 TASS in English 1249 GMT 2 Aug 85

[Text] Moscow, August 2 TASS -- TASS commentator Vasiliy Kharkov writes: The impression is that some statements by officials in Tokyo are aimed more at Washington than at Japanese public opinion, which the makers of such statements appear to ignore. This can be exemplified by an interview given to the American television network NBC by Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone. His pronouncements in that interview included one concerning his attitude to the Soviet Union's new and major foreign policy initiative to unilaterally stop any nuclear explosions from August 6. Speaking about that important peaceful step by the USSR, he said it is "insufficient" and tried to motivate his negative attitude to the Soviet moratorium by contending that it is unverifiable.

But this clearly far-fetched argument, which is, incidentally, dismissed by leading scientists and experts as totally untenable, is also being invoked in Washington. So Mr Nakasone did nothing more than repeating the American Administration's claim.

In the meantime, Japan's interest in such an important issue as an end to nuclear testing, which would sharply slow down the nuclear arms race, can be called vital without exaggeration. Nakasone granted the interview to the American TV network shortly before the 40th anniversary of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki tragedy, which claimed the lives of more than 300,000 of his compatriots. Many Japanese people who were exposed to radiation as a result of the American A-bomb blasts continue to die. Their children and grandchildren die from radiation sickness.

The 40th anniversary of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki tragedy is another reminder of the pressing need to enforce a total ban on nuclear weapons and scrap them. And an end to nuclear testing is a right way to this goal.

So when, ahead of this anniversary marked by all people of goodwill in their determination to put an end to the nuclear arms race on earth and keep it out of space, Mr Nakasone speaks negatively of the Soviet Union's decision to unilaterally stop any nuclear explosions, his position appears more than strange.

There are, it is clear, forces in Japan, which would like not only to forget themselves the American atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki but also to erase the memory of those terrible events from the people's memory.

But the overwhelming majority of the Japanese people are active in the campaign to make certain that nuclear blasts no longer threaten people on earth and that the horrors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki recur never again. This resolve of their people has been expressed, for example, by Japanese young men and women taking part in the 12th World Festival of Youth and Students in Moscow. Yuzi Egusa from Hiroshima, who has survived the tragedy of that city, said the Soviet initiative is remarkable. As a representative of the atomic blast victims, he believes that the very existence of the barbarous weapons of mass annihilation is inadmissible.

CSO: 5200/1347

NUCLEAR TESTING

AUSTRALIA ON U.S. ACCEPTANCE OF TEST BAN TREATY PROGRAM

BK280716 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0830 GMT 28 Jul 85

[Text] Australia has gained U.S. acceptance of its program of work towards a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty. The turnaround came at the United Nations Conference on Disarmament in Geneva and follows 2 years of stalling by the Americans in both the UN General Assembly and the Geneva conference. The United States has now put its signature to a plan tabled in the conference by Australia's ambassador for disarmament, Mr Richard Butler.

Mr Butler told AUSTRALIAN ASSOCIATED PRESS [AAP] that Australia hoped other members of the conference would recognize this breakthrough and agree to work under the program. Australia has been pressing for progress towards such a treaty since such a move was passed in the UN 2 years ago and endorsed again last year. The United States abstained on both occasions.

AAP says the Soviet Union has said it wants an immediate negotiation of the text for such a treaty -- a position the UN [as heard] has opposed on the grounds that verification procedures to ensure that the treaty is adhered to be worked out first. Australia has been appointed subject coordinator for the western group on the issue -- a move which is seen as a major endorsement of its lead role.

CSO: 5200/4346



NUCLEAR TESTING

POLISH GOVERNMENT SPOKESMAN ON USSR MORATORIUM, UN DELEGATION

LD301917 Warsaw Television Service in Polish 1700 GMT 30 Jul 85

[Passages within quotation marks recorded]

[Text] Here is a report on today's press conference given by Jerzy Urban, government press spokesman, for foreign correspondents. Our reporter, Marek Kassa, also attended.

[Kassa] At the outset of today's conference Minister Jerzy Urban made two statements. Here is an excerpt from the first one.

[Urban] "The Polish Government expresses full and resolute support for the USSR decision for a unilateral moratorium on all kinds of nuclear explosions announced yesterday by CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev. We consider this decision of the USSR as yet more proof of the consistent peaceful policy of this state, which considers the fundamental goal of its international activity to prevent the outbreak of a nuclear catastrophe, to achieve an end to the arms race, and to move to concrete disarmament steps, until the achievement of universal and total disarmament."

[Kassa] The second statement concerned the Polish delegation headed by General Wojciech Jaruzelski to the 40th session of the UN General Assembly.

[Urban] "As I have already informed you, the Polish delegation to the 40th session of the UN General Assembly will be headed by Premier Wojciech Jaruzelski. The head of the Polish delegation will be the second speaker in the general debate, and he will speak as the first of the representatives of the socialist countries. Army General Wojciech Jaruzelski will present the voice of the Polish nation on the key current issues. The Polish view on the contemporary international situation will be pronounced.

"The main principles of Polish foreign policy will be defined in the name of the Polish state." The premier will present the views of Poles on fundamental matters of national security, including the economic security of Poland. Before expressing the voice of the nation at the United Nations, the chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers desires to get acquainted in detail with the opinions of the citizens. That is why the presentation of the stance of the socialist Polish state will be preceded by a social consultation.

"Anyone who desires can convey by letter or by telephone their views on the subjects that will constitute the content of the speech by the chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers. This concerns the international situation and anxieties connected with it, the position of Poland in the world, and our contribution to world peace.

## NUCLEAR TESTING

POLES SEE NUCLEAR MORATORIUM AS CONSISTENT USSR POLICY

AU011124 Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA in Polish 30 Jul 85 p 7

[Ryszard Wojna commentary: "A Key Proposal"]

[Text] Against the background of the dramatic race that has been going on since Hiroshima between the development of increasingly better nuclear means of mass annihilation, on the one hand, and common sense and the desire to preserve mankind, on the other, the USSR has once again proved to be the driving force behind the processes expected to help man tame the destructive forces triggered by him.

The Soviet decision to halt unilaterally all kinds of nuclear blasts amounts to proposing that the development of nuclear and armament technologies be halted at the present level, since no progress can be made without experimental blasts.

This means that CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev has proposed to the U.S. Government and to the other countries possessing nuclear weapons that at least the qualitative development of the nuclear arms race be halted, a race that successive U.S. administrations have been intensifying for the past 40 years, seeking to devise increasingly more perfect nuclear weapon systems.

The number of nuclear warheads that are ready for use and that have been deployed in various regions of our globe amounts to tens of thousands. The death potential of these warheads is no longer measured by the number of people who can be killed, but by the absurd factor of overkill. Still, the United States is not satisfied with this overkill, and the U.S. Government continues to place orders for increasingly more sophisticated weapons as attested to by the most recent plans for the so-called "star wars," the results of which it is impossible to foresee.

We repeat that, since Hiroshima, Washington has always promoted the nuclear arms race, whereas Moscow has continued, with some delay, to counter every U.S. violation of the balance of power and to do all it can to put an end to this mad competition. This assertion is not a result of ideological or political partiality for either power. It is an expression of objective truth, which it is impossible to question.

This time the Soviet moratorium actually amounts to a proposal of the highest significance: to halt the development of nuclear weapons technology at the present level!

The meaning of words that Mikhail Gorbachev spoke at the Warsaw meeting of leaders of the Warsaw Pact countries 3 months ago reverberates like an echo: If we are able to reach an accord on what is most important, everything will be possible, that is, every following accord will be possible.

M. Gorbachev has been at the helm of Soviet policy for not quite 6 months, but the consistent line of his conduct and various initiatives aimed at only one goal -- to halt the arms race and to rebuild mutual trust -- continue to stimulate world politics in a qualitatively new way.

The Polish public, which attaches such importance to improving the international climate and to halting the arms race because it is a source of tension and wars, will watch with utmost attention the response of the other possessors of nuclear weapons to the Soviet moratorium.

President Reagan and his aides have often said that the massive U.S. armaments program, which is being promoted by the present administration, has inspired the United States with a feeling of might and security. Some U.S. politicians have even said that the United States has won superiority in the past few months.

What, then, could prevent Washington from following suit and proclaiming, like Moscow, a moratorium on all tests of nuclear weapons?

CSO: 5200/3080

NUCLEAR TESTING

POLISH REPORTING ON USSR NUCLEAR TEST DECISIONS, U.S. RESPONSE

'Negative' U.S. Reaction Noted

LD301233 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 1005 GMT 30 Jul 85

[Commentary by Andrzej Wyhowicz]

[Text] The meeting in Helsinki is not simply an occasional ceremony to mark the jubilee. It must be assessed as an important moment in East-West dialogue, a dialogue which has gradually begun to enliven this year. Of course, attention is primarily focused on the meeting between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, since it is expected that the foundations for the Soviet-American summit will be laid during their talk and that both heads of diplomacy will discuss the subjects of the talks between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan.

The political atmosphere in international relations is important for the Helsinki meeting. It is no accident that the USSR has announced a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear tests just before the beginning of the talks in the Finnish capital. The date on which the moratorium is to come into force is not accidental either: the 40th anniversary of the dropping of the atom bomb on Hiroshima. That date recalls the responsibility weighing on all states not to allow a dangerous arms race, and on states with nuclear weapons to limit their arsenals of those weapons because the greatest threat to the world is undoubtedly a nuclear arms race. The Soviet moratorium is at the same time a proposal for the United States to do likewise. If the Soviet initiative was an attempt to improve the international atmosphere, the immediate and negative American response shows how difficult it is to overcome the obstacles piling up on the road to agreement. Commenting on Shultz' statement that the United States is not interested at present in halting nuclear tests, a Soviet spokesman stated that there is a lack of political will on the American side to take such a step. The meeting in Helsinki will show what the political will of its participants is regarding the principles accepted 10 years ago by 35 states of Europe and North America to create a lasting basis of international relations.

U.S. 'Offensive' Strategy Noted

LD301839 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 1700 GMT 30 Jul 85

[Maksymilian Berezowski report from Washington]

[Text] The American refusal to join in the proposal of the USSR in the matter of halting nuclear arms tests is being explained here in two ways. Publicly, and in the interest of propaganda, the Reagan administration states that one cannot rely on this

proposal and that it has not yet been agreed how to check on whether the ban is being observed. However, in unofficial conversations quoted today by THE NEW YORK TIMES, administration officials gave the true reasons for the rejection of Mikhail Gorbachev's proposal. They revealed that the continuation of underground tests is necessary for the preparation of laser weapons that are to be an element of "star wars," that is, space armaments. Second, nuclear warheads are to be perfected during the tests for the new intercontinental MX missiles and D-5 missiles for submarines. Third, the Pentagon is trying out a command system that will allow the United States, using Defense Secretary Weinberger's own words, to carry out a protracted nuclear war in which the United States would have the upper hand.

Thus, the refusal to halt tests is a direct result of the offensive global strategy of the Reagan administration and calculations of supremacy that cause the arms race.

In connection with the publicized American counterproposal, many experts here have admitted that the invitation of Soviet specialists to observe the American nuclear test in Nevada in no way equals the decision of the USSR to break off these tests. William Hyland, the head of the authoritative publication FOREIGN AFFAIRS, has stated that this fact will strengthen the USSR's position before the November Gorbachev-Reagan summit.

CSO: 5200/3079

NUCLEAR TESTING

POLISH COMMENTARIES ON SOVIET TEST MORATORIUM

Contrasted With U.S. Policy

LD292012 Warsaw Television Service in Polish 1730 GMT 29 Jul 85

[By Zdzislaw Morawski]

[Text] The decision announced today in Moscow means that the USSR will halt all nuclear weapons experiments and explosions regardless of whether other states follow suit. There is no need for explaining that this is a decision of very serious political and military significance. The decision comes into force on 6 August, the 40th anniversary of the beginning of the nuclear era with the tragic nuclear explosion over Hiroshima.

Since that explosion the United States has constantly aimed at gaining a military advantage over the USSR, as well as a nuclear advantage. It has never achieved this goal, which is still declared a fundamental task, a fundamental direction of foreign policy, and the line they want to follow in their relations with the world.

This line and activity are contrasted with the consecutive serious disarmament initiative of political and military significance by the USSR. I say consecutive because not so long ago Mikhail Gorbachev also announced a unilateral moratorium on the deployment of Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe.

As we can see, on one side we are dealing with a policy based on armament and on increasing tensions -- here I think of U.S. policy -- and on the other, we are dealing with a policy based on setting detente and disarmament processes in motion again -- and here I think of Soviet policy.

I think it is not a coincidence that the moratorium was announced on the eve of the 10th anniversary of the signing of a very important document -- the Final Act signed 10 years ago in Helsinki. Foreign ministers from East and West are arriving now in Helsinki. Surely today's Soviet initiative will give new meaning to their talks in the coming days, and I think that the initiative constitutes a good prognosis for these talks and for the world disarmament process.

Decision of 'Great Importance'

LD300853 Warsaw PAP in English 0030 GMT 30 Jul 85

["Soviet Disarmament Initiatives" -- PAP headline; by PAP political commentator]

[Text] Warsaw, July 30 -- Soviet Union's decision on a unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests till January 1, 1986 is an event of great importance. It is a decision which supports the consistent line of Soviet foreign policy meant to lower international tension and strengthen peace.

It has not been a coincidence that Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests was announced just now. Foreign ministers from countries-signatories to the CSCE Final Act are about to meet in Helsinki. The world public opinion expects that the meeting, called on the 10th anniversary of the memorable conference from 1975, will become a new impulse permitting rebirth of the detente process not only in Europe but also in the global scale. The initiative of the Soviet Union is a perfect example for other countries to follow. It has also not been a coincidence that the Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests becomes effective on August 6, the tragic anniversary of Hiroshima -- the first city-victim to an atom bomb.

Announcing the moratorium, the Soviet Union has called on the United States to follow suit. Of course, it is difficult to forejudge at the present moment on the reaction of Washington. Nevertheless, it should be recalled that American Administration has made intensive efforts in the last dozen or so months to gain support from its West European allies for the so-called strategic defense initiative of the "star wars" programme. Implementation of this programme would extend the arms race into outer space. If this would really happen then -- and this is a popular opinion among politicians and scientists -- a marked deterioration of international relations could be observed with a considerable intensification of the threat of a nuclear war.

The Soviet Union has forwarded disarmament initiatives and called on the United States to give up their "star wars" programme on many occasions. The latest Soviet decision -- moratorium on all nuclear tests -- also aims in this direction.

#### Significance for Helsinki Noted

LD300841 Warsaw PAP in English 0042 GMT 30 Jul 85

[From the press review]

[Text] Warsaw, July 30 -- In a commentary devoted to the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on all kinds of nuclear tests, today's ZYCIE WARSZAWY daily wrote:

"This successive Soviet initiative of great significance is on the one hand an aftermath of the peaceful foreign policy, the blocking of nuclear arms, for limitation and reduction of all armaments. On the other hand, it is an encouragement for the countries belonging to the "nuclear club" to refrain from other tests with this weapon.

"It is a good example, showing of the road for cooperation which may bring an agreement between states both in this matter and in other fields.

"It is worth recalling, that many a time in the past, the Soviet Union proposed to the nuclear states with an agreement on the moratorium on all nuclear explosions, to start with a jointly fixed date. Unfortunately, all the hitherto Soviet proposals did not meet a positive response.

"This time the Soviet Union solely takes the unilateral decision. Undoubtedly, it is charged with significant, positive political meaning. However, whether it is fruitful, will not depend on the Soviet Union only," the daily emphasized.

"The six-month moratorium on conducting any kind of tests with nuclear-weapons announced by Mikhail Gorbachev yesterday is an act of good will of extraordinary importance," said today's party daily TRYBUNA LUDU in a commentary on the same subject.

"Undoubtedly, the new decision of the USSR will have a positive influence on the course of the conference of foreign ministers from 38 states-signatories to the CSCE Final Act to open in Helsinki today.

"It cannot but influence in a significant way the initial attitude and the preparations for Soviet-U.S. summit scheduled for this coming November in Geneva as well as the 40th jubilee session of the UN General Assembly to be held this year.

"Thus, it is an initiative of great significance and scope whose influence on the shaping of international situation is already now difficult to be full assessed", wrote the daily in conclusion.

CSO: 5200/3074

- END -